



Library of


Wellesley



College.

Presented by

No





J. Whitwell

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.
W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume IV.

*WITH ETCHING OF BISHOP LIGHTFOOT,
BY H. MANESSE.*

LONDON:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON.

NEW YORK:
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & COMPANY,
38, WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET.

MDCCCLXXXVI.

[All rights reserved.]

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

Contributors to Volume IV.

RIGHT REV. W. ALEXANDER, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. PROF. S. IVES CURTISS, D.D., PH.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.
REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. PROF. JOHN FORBES, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. F. GODET, D.D.
REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.
H. S. KEATING.
REV. JOHN KER, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, M.A.
REV. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL RAINY, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D.
DR. S. M. SCHILLER-SZINESSY.
GEORGE AUGUSTUS SIMCOX, M.A.
REV. W. H. SIMCOX, M.A.
REV. PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.
HON. LADY WELBY-GREGORY.
DR. K. WESSELY.
REV. PROF. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A.
THE EDITOR.

*SOME GLEANINGS FROM ST. PETER'S
HARVEST-FIELD.*

ST. PETER'S EPISTLES.

I.

PREFACE.—THEOLOGY OF THE INSCRIPTION.

“Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.”—1 PETER i. 1, 2.

IN the present short series of papers I shall attempt, as far as possible, to trace the spirit and character of St. Peter in his letters—to connect the writer of the Epistles with the Apostle of whom we hear so much in the Gospels and in the first part of the Acts. I shall begin by tracing the life of St. Peter after the Resurrection, as recorded by St. Luke. An examination of the inscription of the Epistle may give us some notion of its theological richness and depth.

I. In the record of the life of Peter in the Acts, we find an immediate, and, when duly considered, an adequate fulfilment of the great promise—“thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.”¹

In the earliest portion of the Acts, Peter's is a “colossal and commanding” figure. He has at once a form of granite and a heart of flesh. He has the strength that stays and

¹ Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

the voice that wins. He is the rock of the Church and the shepherd of the flock. St. Peter in the Acts fulfils, in three important particulars, the lofty promise that has been quoted.

He is first in the first election to the vacant apostolate.¹ He is first in the first great conversion of souls. His word rolls like the storm. It cuts and pierces like the sword.² We do not require to have the imagination exalted by the vast gilded letters round the cupola of St. Peter's at Rome. This is truly to hold the keys, and to roll back the doors of the Kingdom!

But the great promise to St. Peter is fulfilled in a second way. Spiritual sin would steal into the Church; it would glide in under a haze of profession and pretence, as Milton tells us that Satan passed in mist into Paradise. It is Peter who speaks with such awful power.³ Simon makes an attempt to buy the gift of God with money, and brands upon his own name for ever⁴ its ill-omened connexion with the foul offence (far from obsolete) of buying spiritual offices. Peter's voice pronounces his condemnation.⁵ Herod and his quaternion of soldiers cannot keep the servant of Christ, from whose hands the chains fall off. In all these particulars he seems to represent the Church, against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail.

But there is exhibited yet another fulfilment to the great promise. Peter was again the first to divine the secret of God, to follow the mind of the Spirit. He climbs rapidly to the highest peak, and is the first herald of the dawn. The old is, no doubt, very dear to him; he clings to all that is devout and venerable with the tenacious loyalty of a Hebrew high churchman. He goes up "into the Temple

¹ Acts i. 15-23.

² Acts ii. 14-36 (*δὲν ὑμεῖς ἰσταυρώσατε. . . . κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν.* "*Aculus in fine.*"—Bengel) cf. iii. 12; iv. 4.

³ Acts v. 3, 8, 9, 10.

⁴ *Simony.*

⁵ Acts viii. 20.

at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." He ascends the house-top "to pray at the sixth hour."¹ The services of the Temple and the synagogue go on upon a parallel line with the first eucharists.² But this Hebraic Christianity, or Christian Hebraism, cannot continue indefinitely. There are souls among the Gentiles longing for forgiveness, for rest and purity. They are not to dwell in the shadow, to tarry disappointed in the vestibule for ever. It is for Peter to fling back the doors once again. He receives the vision in the house of Simon, the tanner, by the sea-side.

Far o'er the glowing western main
His wistful brow was upward raised,
Where, like an angel's train,
The burnished waters blazed.³

And now his part as founder and rock is almost over. The reception of Cornelius is his last great act. The last mention of his name in St. Luke's narrative is in these sentences: "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, *Peter* rose and said"⁴—his last words are characteristic—"But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."⁵

But we should note that by these two Epistles St. Peter carries out another commission of his Lord—"Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you,"⁶ that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for *thee*. And do thou, when once thou hast turned again, *strengthen* thy brethren."⁷ The very word ("strengthen") occurs, in different form, *five* times in these Epistles.

¹ Acts iii. 1; x. 9.

³ "Christian Year," Easter Monday.

⁵ Acts xv. 11.

⁶ *ὑμᾶς*, plural.

² Acts ii. 42-46.

⁴ Acts xv. 5, 6, 7.

⁷ Luke xxii. 31, 32, *στήρισον*.

The first Epistle was, in all probability, written from Rome, from the mystical Babylon, not the literal city upon the Euphrates.¹ There was danger impending in the Rome of Nero. There was a hidden fire, which only waited a breath to blaze out in its fury. "The fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you."² The second Epistle was written soon after the first indeed,³ but actually under the shadow of impending death. How was this known to St. Peter? One of the few beautiful legends of St. Peter at Rome gives an answer. When the persecution actually arose, the Christians begged their beloved pastor not to remain. He listened to their entreaties, perhaps to the feebleness of his own heart. But as he fled along the Appian Way, Christ stood before him. "Domine, quo vadis?" "Lord, whither goest Thou?" asked the Apostle. And a church, named from those three words, is supposed to mark the spot where they were uttered. "I come," said the Lord, "to be again crucified at Rome." A good illustration of the favourite saying of a wise and holy soul—"never run after a cross, and never run away from it." And so Peter turned to be crucified, head downward, upon the Vatican.

But we need no legend to tell us how the knowledge was bestowed upon St. Peter. We have history.

We have but to turn back to the closing chapter of St. John's Gospel. Immediately after the great commission, Jesus continues, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast younger, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst

¹ 1 Peter v. 13. The most interesting summaries of the argument on this disputed question will, perhaps, be found: for St. Peter's sojourn at Rome, Renan (*l'Antechrist*, pp. 551-557); for the literal Babylon, Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 94-101. Against the view which I have adopted is unquestionably Niebuhr's remark, that in 1 Peter i. 1, the countries are addressed, not from west to east (as would be natural for one writing from Rome), but from east to west (as would be natural in writing from Babylon).

² τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πορώσει πρὸς πειρασμῶν (1 Pet. iv. 12).

³ This is implied in ταύτην ἤδη ἀγαπητοί, δεύτεραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν (2 Pet. iii. 1).

whither thou wouldest." "Younger," that signifies the years up to the frontier of the icy region of old age. It is no tape-line measure; it is a limit which is differently fixed, as it is surveyed by the old or the young. "Forty," says Victor Hugo, "is the old age of youth; fifty is the youth of old age." "Thou didst gird thyself," as when not long before he girt his fisher's coat unto him,¹ "and walkedst,"—as with Thomas and Nathanael, and the other five²—"whither thou wouldest," as when he exclaimed with masterful independence, "I go a fishing."³ "But when thou shalt be growing old"⁴—for he shall not go far into the land of frost and darkness—"thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee." "This spake He signifying by what death Peter should glorify God."⁵ Why should believers affect a little rationalism here? why should they minimise the wonder of the prophecy, or affect, with a provoking candour, to doubt whether St. John's explanation really means what it *must* have meant to those who read it? What a contrast in the character of the two Apostles! St. John's nature is at once more lofty and more spiritually penetrating.⁶ His work is like Peter's no more than his nature. It is more pastoral or episcopal. Not the great missionary or orator, or expositor; but the dogmatic teacher, his spirit more like the finest essence of some established Church. One gentle word gathers up the biography of long uneventful years—"abiding"⁷ in the boat, in the Church, in life, in one spot. So stands before us the Primate of Christendom, not at Rome but Ephesus. How different too the scenes of their death. In that more than magic glass for one the Vatican gardens, the hurrying feet, the bound hands, the prelude to a death of agony, which nature "wills not;" for the other, the calm old

¹ John xxi. 7.² *Ibid.* v. 5.³ *Ibid.* v. 3.⁴ ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς.⁵ *Ibid.* vv. 18, 19.⁶ ὑψηλότερος καὶ διορατικώτερος.⁷ μένων, vv. 22, 23.

age, the seer with a glory opening upon him beyond that of the Grecian skies. Their Lord gave them a gem. In the clear obscure of its lucent depths, for the one was the glory of John's Apocalypse, for the other the outline of Peter's cross. With this passage before us there can be little doubt how St. Peter knew of his approaching death. On the one hand, youth had ebbed away; old age was come. On the other, a fiery trial was on them. No wonder that he wrote, "knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly—even *as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me.*"¹

On the whole, then, shortly before St. Peter's death, went that true encyclical, at once so humble and so majestic, from Rome to the Asian Churches, from the hills of Pontus to the cities of the Ægean. It was written with four great objects in view. (1) From a high post of observation to warn Christian hearts, as by a storm-signal, of impending danger. (2) To utter notes of warning against dangerous sins. (3) To inculcate peaceful submission to constituted authority, in a time of Jewish agitation.² (4) Above all, to proclaim without reserve his exact agreement with St. Paul.³

II. When we pass to the inscription:—

1. We note the extraordinary richness of thoughts and subjects. The Church, visible and invisible; the pilgrim life of the saints; the counsel of God towards us; sanctification; atonement; the underlying mystery of the Holy Trinity ("foreknowledge of God the Father," "sanctification of the Spirit," "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ"); grace and peace; all are here. To know these thickly crowded lines truly would be to know the Gospel.

¹ 2 Pet. i. 14.

² 1 Pet. ii. 14.

³ Of the great importance of 1 Pet. v. 12 from this point of view, I may have occasion to speak again (cf. 2 Pet. i. 12; iii. 15, 16). It is remarked by Estius and à Lapide, with creditable candour, that the Galatians are specially addressed by St. Peter—but in the Epistle to the Galatians Peter is censured, ii. 15.

Of all religious writings none but those of Scripture possess this teeming life, the Gospel in every fragment, the Divine presence in every crumb. It is as when in a mirror broken outside a house, each splinter reflects all the blue of heaven; or, as when beside a boat, one bubble images all the sea and sky. In poetry we do not find this characteristic in Milton, Keble, Heber, Toplady; we do find it in the Psalms. In prose it is not in Augustine, à Kempis, Fenelon, Doddridge, but it *is* in St. Paul, in St. John, in St. Peter.

2. Let us look at the three attributes which the Apostle assigns to those whom he addresses.

Elect. Election here is assumed by the writer from vocation. All who are duly grafted into the Church, and who profess the faith of Christ, and do not palpably cut themselves off from the fellowship of faithful people, are assumed to be elect. Yet that this is not the shallow, easy-going creed of modern latitudinarianism he makes evident very early in his second Epistle—"give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure."¹

Strangers. The literal and the spiritual blend here. Some of the provinces to which those Christians belonged were fair, their climate was balmy, and their mountains glorious. Yet none of these tracts was their fatherland. Peter, who knew Scripture so well, had in his ear two ripples² from that great deep. He would remind them of Abraham, rising up with a riven heart from before his dead, and saying to the children of Heth, "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you."³ He would let them hear something of the wailing pathos of the psalm: "I am a stranger with thee, a sojourner, as all my fathers were."⁴ His meaning is that of the old Christian apologist. "Christians inhabit their own land, but as sojourners. They

¹ 2 Pet. i. 10.

³ Gen. xxiii. 4.

² *i.e.* in the version of the LXX.

⁴ Ps. xxxix. 12, cf. Heb. xi. 13.

share in all things outwardly as citizens, and endure all things as strangers. Every foreign land is theirs, and every land foreign.”¹ Home is the one thing sweet on earth. But home is built not of stones, but of hearts. And hearts are breaking and ceasing to beat every year, as the patriarch knew who first used the word.

“Of the dispersion.” Here we have a word which, carefully considered, is in itself a wonder. It was, so to speak, fashioned and laid up in the repertory of prophecy to be used when the season came, and it should be wanted—fashioned and laid up hundreds of years before the time came when it could be applied to a realised fact. It is the prophetic word for the Israelites to be scattered among all people.² It is a fitting name for Christians in the world, and does not necessarily prove that St. Peter wrote exclusively to *Jewish* converts.

3. Let us observe the three prepositions in the second verse, “according to,” “in,” unto.”³

It is not, I think, pedantic or fanciful to say that we have combined here the three favourite prepositions, the three characteristic prepositions, of the three great writers of the New Testament. “According to” is St. Paul’s favourite. It is the expression of a deep sense that our Redemption is after a great purpose, in accordance with an unerring law—no beautiful accident, no temporary caprice, no sweet uncertain note, but the essential purpose of things, the outcome of the wisdom of God, the fixed theme of the harmony of the world. “In” is St. John’s favourite preposition. It is a state in which one lives; it is, so to speak, atmospheric; it means, as a great scholar has said, “inclusive fixity in

¹ S. Justin Mart. *Epist. ad Diogn.*, c. 5. Æschines is quoted by Grimm as saying *παρπεδηγία τις ἔστω ὁ βίος*.—*I.e.* 331.

² *ἔσθ' διασπορά κ.τ.λ.*, Deut. xxviii. 25, LXX.; cf. xxx. 4; Isa. xlix. 6. Used of Babylonian exiles, Jer. xxxiv. 17; Ps. cxlvii. 2. See in N. T., John vii. 35. Hence Christians among Gentiles here, and James i. 1.

³ *κἄτα, ἐν, εἰς*.

time and place.”¹ “Unto” is St. Peter’s favourite preposition; a tendency towards which one moves, a goal which it must reach spontaneously and irresistibly, constant motion *to* or *into*. The first suits the theology of grace, the second the theology of the mystical and sacramental life, the third the life of religious feeling and action. The first is characteristic of the apostle of faith, the second of the apostle of love, the third of the apostle of forward impulse.

4. “According to foreknowledge of God the Father”—a Pauline thought with the Pauline preposition. Yet the word is *Petrine* too. Peter had said to the men of Israel on the day of Pentecost, that Jesus was “delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.”² Of all generations of the Church this is the last which should slur over these words. Of Calvinism in the extreme sense of the word there is little danger, of Augustinianism little hope. Men believe in God too little to be Calvinists; they believe too little in thought to be Augustinian. The progress of positive science has overthrown metaphysics and with it has gone the theology of grace, in popular estimation. But its time will come again, *does* come to most earnest souls.

Now let us observe that there is something of necessary *anthropopathy* in applying foreknowledge to God. “Before” and “after” in strict logic are inadequate. “Continu-
tion,” if there were such a word, might be more fitting. Three Latin words are used by Augustine for the purpose of declaring that God knows all things, once for all, simultaneously, for ever.³ Observe, too, that “foreknowledge” is very generally used for predestination in its bearing upon those who believe.⁴

But the meaning of “elect according to foreknowledge of

¹ Donaldson, *Gr. Gr.*, § 476.

² Acts ii. 23.

³ “Semel, simul, semper.”—*Confess.*, xi. 14.

⁴ “Præscienti Dei, cum de bonis ponitur eadem cum prædestinatione.”—Estius.

God the Father," is best read by a loving heart. It is all sheer grace, unmerited love, that business of our salvation, from the first page to the last. God did not wait for this late lonely moment which we call our life, to love us. That would be a hard, dry, unlovely chronology to apply to the love of the Eternal. Long before our birth took place, before our parents heard our first cry, God loved us, thought of us. When the hour came, He executed in time what He had meditated in eternity. These poor years of ours are steeped in the light of everlasting years. "O love without beginning, which loved me through the infinite ages," cries Fénelon. We are not here dwelling with the ferocious Calvinism of a certain modern scholasticism (if such a thing survives) which, I suppose, Calvin himself never held, which terrifies and condemns. We are heart to heart with predestination to life, with the predestination which winds round the feeble and suffering child hands that are soft as love and strong as eternity. All who are touched by grace may reason with that tender logic, the syllogism of the soul: may translate the active verb of our human consciousness into the passive of Divine power. "I move my life towards God; therefore I am moved. I love God; therefore, I am loved. I choose God; therefore, I am chosen."

5. Only just remarking that "sanctification" is the atmosphere and contexture in which the life that answers to its election "according to foreknowledge of God the Father," must lie, we think last of the peculiarly Petrine clause,—“unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.”

Deferring for a moment what we have to say of obedience, let us dwell upon the familiar term—the blood of Jesus Christ.

There is a perpetual danger of cant and unreality in our use of religious language, without true religious effort of

mind. Much indeed of all our language is, as a great philosopher has called it, "*cæca cogitatio*,"¹ a sort of blind thought. We pack up a whole bundle of ideas in a single term; but we run the string by which they are held into an inextricable knot, and flatter ourselves that we can untie it any time, and possess the contents. This is the secret of lifeless systems, mechanically held propositions, dead dogmas.

The Blood then is the Blood poured forth, *i.e.* the visible expression of the whole voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God. It is the most important consequence of the central Gospel fact, the Incarnation, under the most affecting image of human suffering and devotion. It is dogma, concentrated dogma, but dogma made picturesque, pathetic, victorious; picturesque as the crucifix in the light of a setting sun upon a Southern peak—pathetic as the red stain upon the earth where one we love has bled—victorious in the battle which has been won by the sacrifice of a great life. It tells us of the death of the body from which it passed; of the reality of the suffering by which it was elicited; of the reality of the sacrifice of whose idea it was the visible translation into historical fact. It was the palpable fulfilment of all that was symbolized by the sacrifices of the Old Testament. The old commentators on the "sprinkling of blood," in the Epistle to the Hebrews, were never tired of quoting the saying of the rabbis, "the root of sacrifice is in the sprinkling of the blood."² It should not be forgotten that the word rendered "sprinkling" has, in the original, a passive tinge,—"*besprinklement with, being sprinkled by.*" "No one is actually freed from sin," writes one long dead, "through the blood of Christ, unless he be sprinkled with it, *i.e.* unless Christ's merits be applied to him."

Before saying my last word upon the order observed by

¹ Leibnitz.

² "*Radix sacrificii in aspersione sanguinis.*"

the Apostle in these two things, I ask *how* and *when* we are brought to the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ?"

Baptism were not baptism without this, "one baptism for the forgiveness of sins." Prayer were not prayer without this, for all prayer is "through Jesus Christ our Lord." Holy communion is the soul drawing near to have this applied. The devout communicant is he who comes to be sprinkled. Devout meditation on the death and passion is placing ourselves within its reach. There is no Christ for us without the cross, no cross without the Blood. Occasions, too, there are every day for reaching forth "unto" this, bringing ourselves into touch with it. For we have all something to suffer every day. Little wearying things, petty trials of temper, minute cares, small humiliations. Let us unite them to His. So shall the dull lead be turned to red gold, and the poor rags covered with purple raiment.

Now for the order here observed by St. Peter.

All own that this "sprinkling" is the beginning of salvation. Yes! but the Apostle feels and says that it is the end too. Repentance is necessary. There is a sense in which we must be bathed in tears. "I water my couch with my tears," moans David in one penitential psalm. But there must be more. "Wash Thou me, and I shall be whiter than snow."¹ If election is made sure; after "according to," after "in," after the first part of "unto," must follow something more. God's servant lies on the bed from which he shall never rise. After the holiest life, as it seems to us, we still pray, "wash his soul in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, who was slain to take away the sins of the world." If any spoke of his election being proved by its being "unto obedience," he would add "*and* sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ." Well said a saint of old "the

¹ Psalm vi. 6; li. 7.

Blood of Christ is the key of Paradise.”¹ As we read these simple words on which I have commented, the very “shadow of Peter passes by.” May it overshadow some of us!

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

AN Oxford man, whose interests are in theology, cannot but look wistfully towards what we are in the habit of calling our sister university at Cambridge. As a sister we think of her, with affection and pride, but with something too of that generous rivalry which does not like to feel itself altogether distanced. We have indeed some consolations. We have had and have divines of philosophic grasp and of fine and beautiful temper, who are not in the first instance exegetes or critics; and we look forward with great hope to what may be done in the department of Old Testament and Hebrew studies. But in the field of New Testament exegesis and analytic criticism we have nothing at all comparable to the little group of Professors who a few years ago shed lustre upon Cambridge. It is a matter of great rejoicing to us that, though lost to Cambridge, the Bishop of Durham has not been lost to theological learning; and Cambridge too could afford to miss one of its leaders, while the others remain to it in the full vigour and maturity of their powers.

What, it may be asked, are the particular qualities which have won for Bp. Lightfoot so pre-eminent a place, by the universal consent of all competent judges both in England and on the Continent? It is necessary here to weigh our words; for though the impression which Bp. Lightfoot.

¹ “Sanguis Christi est clavis Paradisi.”—*S. Jerome.*

has left upon the public mind is a very distinct one, yet when a comparison is suggested with other illustrious names, it is not enough to use general phrases, and it becomes important to single out special points which are most characteristic and distinctive. I should be disposed to say, then, that the place which Bp. Lightfoot holds was due not only to his possession, but to his very remarkable balance and combination, of a number of distinct excellences—exactness of scholarship, width of erudition, scientific method, sobriety of judgment, lucidity of style. By taking each of these points in turn, we may be able to define our conception a little more closely.

1. It is perhaps the most marked characteristic of the Cambridge school (if I may call it so, and there is that unity and cohesion about its several parts that it may, I think, fairly be called a “school”), that it starts from a basis of first-rate classical scholarship. In this it differs not only from us at Oxford, but also from the contemporary theology of Germany.

When I speak of Oxford, I do not mean to say that there are not good scholars among us (the best perhaps snatched away, like Bp. Lightfoot, by the ruthless claims of Church government and practical administration), but the leading points in our system are philosophy and history rather than scholarship, and the effect of this is seen on those who have turned their attention specially to theology. In the best Oxford work I fancy that I can trace something that the Germans would call “*allgemein-menschliches*,” a sort of wide culture in the Humanities, which is not commonly found elsewhere, but in scholarship properly so called I am afraid that we too often found wanting.

The rising generation of New Testament students will perhaps hardly remember that Dr. Lightfoot once crossed swords with the leading Oxford scholars. The almost simultaneous appearance of the Commentaries of Bp.

Ellicott (then Professor of Divinity at King's College, London) on Galatians (1854) and Ephesians (1855), with those of the late Dean Stanley on Corinthians, and Professor Jowett on Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans (both in 1855), called forth from Dr. Lightfoot a masterly criticism in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, vol. iii. p. 81 ff. (1857). It was something more than a review of individual books. It was a conflict of principles. And there could be no question on which side the victory lay. One is indeed reminded of the ever memorable passage in which Mark Pattison described Bentley's handling of the unfortunate Collins (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 308). Dean Stanley's Notes on the Corinthians were indeed a very slipshod performance. It was not only that accents were sprinkled about as if from a pepper-caster, but that the statements of other books were, from sheer inaccuracy, frequently misrepresented; assertions were made as to the use of words which were entirely contrary to the facts; the laws of grammar were set at defiance; a note would begin in one way and end in another, or it would express a different view from the translation, or it would be contradicted by another note a few pages later. It is easy to imagine the exposure which Dr. Lightfoot, with his severe Cambridge discipline, would make of this. In the case of Dean Stanley, it was little more than the fly-away criticism which came natural to his too facile and graceful pen. In Prof. Jowett there was not the same airy and engaging carelessness, but there was a deliberate view that the grammar of New Testament Greek was vague and arbitrary. Bp. Lightfoot set himself against this view with all his resources. No reply was made, except a few characteristic words of thanks to critics "unfavourable as well as favourable," in the second edition (1859) of Prof. Jowett's volume. And, so far as my knowledge goes, the conclusions of Bp. Lightfoot's review have never since been questioned.

A little or a narrow mind might have been betrayed into a tone of unseemly elation, or have failed to do justice to the real excellences of the books that were being criticised. It was not so with Dr. Lightfoot. His essay is unfailingly courteous in style, and it shows the fullest and most generous recognition at once of the charm of Dean Stanley's descriptive writing, and of the many-sided suggestiveness of Prof. Jowett. I am not sure that he quite brings out as it deserves the merit, which was conspicuous in both books, of investing the subject with an air of intense reality, of bringing the Scriptures into direct contact with the nineteenth century, not as it might seem to one who only nominally lived in it, but as it really is. From this point of view, the freshness and independence of the two Oxford Commentaries was as extraordinary as their literary execution was striking; and it is these qualities which make them books which should still—certainly not be followed or trusted as specimens of exegesis—but yet be read and digested. They were perhaps the first examples of German criticism being really assimilated by Englishmen and applied to the problems of the New Testament, with a strong national ingredient added. Their value consists not in their positive results, which are, as I imagine, exceedingly small, but in defining, with a skill and individuality which does not fall short of genius, an attitude that English theology should not allow itself to lose.

I have said that Bp. Lightfoot's conclusions as to the Greek of the New Testament have never, to my knowledge, been questioned. And yet it seems to me that Bp. Lightfoot himself held them with a certain amount of reservation, as not at the time when he wrote resting upon a sufficiently wide basis of induction—it is surprising to see that his article, mature as it is both in style and matter, was written within six years of taking his degree. I suspect that the question is not yet really closed, and that there is still room

for a systematic investigation of it. It is a case, as Dr. Lightfoot pointed out, for the solution *ambulando*. "The best test of the truth of the principle here maintained, is the success of its application to the interpretation of St. Paul." My own impression would be that this test was satisfied; but I should not like to speak too confidently, for want of the necessary basis of induction. I am in hopes that the question may be re-started from the Oxford side by the forthcoming publication of a volume of Grinfield Lectures, in which my knowledge of the author prepares me to look for the highest degree of originality and independence along with a very searching examination of the facts. The ultimate event will perhaps be to leave Bp. Lightfoot's principles standing in the main, but in some respects to restrict their application.

In another allied controversy of more recent date, Bp. Lightfoot was equally victorious. At the outset of the work of revising the New Testament, Bp. Lightfoot brought out a book on the subject (*On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, London and New York, 1871), which had a marked effect on public opinion. In this Bp. Lightfoot laid down the rule that "where the same word occurs in the same contexts in the original it should be rendered by the same equivalent in the Version." This position was challenged in a letter to the *Guardian*, by the Rev. J. Earle, Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford, writing as a student of the English language, and pleading for some of the freedom of which many examples are to be seen in the Authorised Version. To this Bp. Lightfoot made a forcible and uncompromising rejoinder in the preface to his second edition (published in 1872). He carried everything before him; and the Revised Version of 1881 bears the deep impress of his authority. I suppose it was inevitable; and yet I must needs confess that I am one of those who cannot help wishing that in this

instance he had been a little less successful. It is a question of degree and of detail. Bp. Lightfoot begins by expressing his entire agreement with Mr. Earle "in deprecating the mode of procedure which would substitute the fidelity of a lexicon for the faithfulness of a translation." "I am well aware," he adds, "that this is a real danger to careful minds trained in habits of minute verbal criticism, and I always have raised and shall raise my voice against any changes which propose to sacrifice forcible English idiom to exact conformity of expression. For instance, it would be mere pedantry to substitute 'Do not ye rather excel them?' for 'Are not ye much better than they?' in Matt. vi. 26 (*οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν*); or 'The hour hath approached,' for 'The hour is at hand,' in Matt. xxvi. 45 (*ἵγγικεν ἡ ὥρα*)." The case could not be better stated. But it seems to me, and I imagine that it will seem to others, that the Revisers as a body have fallen into the temptation against which their spokesman wished to be upon his guard, and that changes have been made which are very much upon a parity with those of which he disapproves. I fear that the Revised Version is only another instance of the extreme difficulty of putting a "new patch on to an old garment."

Let me quickly have done with this word of demur, which does not detract from my warm admiration for Bp. Lightfoot as a scholar. He is a signal example of what I trust may long be retained in our English universities—though the rise of the special Theological School in each of them will have some tendency to make it rarer—the combination of the highest excellence as a scholar with the highest excellence as a theologian in the narrower sense. All through his writings we feel that we have before us the Senior Classic, who was at home in Thucydides and Plato before he was at home in St. Paul; he had shown his skill in many a piece of finished classical com-

position before he undertook to reproduce the Greek of Polycarp where the Latin only was extant; and it was his practised hand and trained sensitiveness to Greek idiom that made itself felt in his felicitous emendations of Clement and Ignatius. It is here that the Cambridge scholar has the advantage over his German competitors.

2. *Width of erudition.* If there is one word that we should naturally apply to Bp. Lightfoot, it is the word "accomplished." No branch of his subject comes amiss to him; and he has brought all to an equally high pitch of perfection. He is pre-eminently an "*all-round* scholar." In every department his eye was quick to recognise at the outset the lines that ought to be pursued, and he has pursued them. Can any theologian be named who has made the use that he has made of inscriptions? From the time when he first utilised the discoveries of the Italian archaeologists for the illustration of the Epistles to the Romans and Philippians (*Journal of Class. and Sac. Philology*, vol. iv. p. 57 ff., "they that are of Cæsar's household"; a somewhat fuller treatment of the subject than in *Philip.* pp. 169-176) down to the recent Introduction to the Ignatian Epistles, in which he has worked up to the full the ample material collected by Prof. W. M. Ramsay, the whole field of Epigraphy has been open to him. Wherever a question of geography or ethnology was raised, Bp. Lightfoot has treated it more like a geographer or ethnologist than a theologian. He was, I believe, the first to introduce into England the results of the researches of Lebas and Waddington; and I know of no one who has such a mastery of the whole range of knowledge which they cover. In reference to exegesis and criticism, I doubt if it is any exaggeration to say that up to the date of his transference to Durham, not a monograph of any importance in England, France, Italy, or Germany seems to have escaped him. Bp. Lightfoot has dealt with many

an outlying author, and with many an obscure and little known period of Church history, and yet I do not know that he has ever been found tripping. His critics may hold different opinions themselves (based very probably in large part upon the materials which Bp. Lightfoot has given them), but I do not remember to have seen or heard of an instance in which he was convicted of what we should call a mistake. This immunity from mistakes has been claimed for another ornament of the Episcopal bench, and I know of no reason why it should not be claimed for Bp. Lightfoot. We have only to think of the range of his published works to realise what this means.

It is this multiform specialism which is of course the distinguishing characteristic of modern commenting, and pre-eminently of Dr. Lightfoot. As compared with a Casaubon or a Baluze, a Pearson or a Dodwell, we may doubt whether the actual volume of knowledge possessed by our contemporary scholars, even the best of them, is at all superior. But in those days learning consisted of a vast number of facts collected by desultory reading, partly stored away in memories of enormous capacity, and partly consigned to copious common-place books. We are still under a very great debt to those who amassed these facts. The men are indeed few and far between who could illustrate an ancient author now as the scholars of the latter half of the sixteenth century, the seventeenth, and the early part of the eighteenth illustrated them. To this day we still plough with their oxen. But as compared with theirs, knowledge is now more *methodised*. It is concentrated upon particular points, and pursued more on system. The theologian is perhaps less of a specialist in the more limited sense than his brother exponent of natural science, where the wonderfully rapid increase of knowledge and discovery has made it impossible to preserve the comprehensive view of the older masters. A leading theologian

still knows something of most parts of his subject. And yet the theologian too has to specialise. A commentator must specialise in several branches at once. This is what Bp. Lightfoot has evidently done, and done with remarkable completeness.

3. *Scientific Method.* If we ask why it is that Bp. Lightfoot's work is so sound and trustworthy, the answer is that it is built upon a foundation of rigorously scientific method. Conclusions are not evolved out of the inner consciousness, but they are suggested in each case by a large collection of facts. It is impossible to take up a note to any of the editions either of the Pauline Epistles or of the Apostolic Fathers without feeling that this was the case. It does not of course follow that others may not collect *more* examples, and that so the balance of the evidence may not be altered, but any assertion of Bp. Lightfoot's we may be sure rests upon a *great number* of examples, sifted and tested with a scholar's instinct. Of course abundant examples of this might be produced from works that are in everybody's hands. They may be found without difficulty simply by turning the pages. But I should once more like to refer to the admirable series of articles in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, which contain the materials (raw materials I cannot call them, for they are much the reverse) that were afterwards embodied in later works—not as is usually the case in less, but in greater fulness. Let any one turn, for instance, to that in vol. iii. p. 289 ff., *On the Style and Character of the Epistle to the Galatians*, and he will feel that there is really nothing more to be said about it, while every argument is clenched by statistics and examples that are undeniable. In this way one subject after another is gradually taken out of the sphere of merely subjective impression and placed upon a basis of irrefragable logic.

4. *Sobriety and Weight of Judgment.* Other writers have

had a scientific method, and yet they do not command the same degree of confidence. It is impossible altogether to eliminate the individual element in critical decisions, and the peculiar reliance which is placed in those of Dr. Lightfoot is due to the sense that they have been most carefully and judiciously weighed. As a critic Dr. Lightfoot is essentially conservative. Thoroughly honest as he is in the recognition of facts, his most marked qualities are caution and circumspection. He is apt to be distrustful of new theories; but—to quote a phrase that was originally used of his great predecessor in the see of Durham—his is “not the unsteadiness of the sceptical but the wariness of the judicial mind.” A novelty of any kind must reckon upon being confronted with a great array of learning and made to establish its case very unmistakeably before it will gain admission. And for this reason Dr. Lightfoot has been almost invariably successful in controversy.¹ He never takes up an idea hastily; and if he is slow to give his thoughts expression, they come with all the more weight of maturity when they are expressed.

The function of such a mind is naturally not so much that of a pioneer opening the way to new positions as to make good positions already won; to bank out floods, to clear away jungle, to lay down roads, and plant gardens

¹ There is perhaps just room to doubt as to the result of that on the last petition of the Lord's Prayer, conducted as will be remembered, in letters to the *Guardian* soon after the appearance of the Revised Version. Dr. Lightfoot certainly made some strong points, especially the consent of the Greek Fathers. But to set against these, if I am not mistaken, there was considerable diversity among the Versions; and a really weighty argument, on the same side, was furnished by contemporary Jewish usage, which the best judges pronounced to be in favour of “evil” not “the evil one.” It would be a very great boon to students if Dr. Lightfoot could be persuaded to reprint his letters to the *Guardian*, as well as the papers in the *Contemporary* in reply to *Supernatural Religion*. At present neither of these series is so accessible as could be wished. It was perhaps matter of regret that the fragments of a once projected History of Early Christian Literature should have taken so polemical a form as they did in the controversy with *Supernatural Religion*, but the world would far sooner have them in this or in any form, than not have them at all.

and orchards. This is hardly a fanciful figure to represent the aspect of any great question, like the Ignatian, after it leaves Dr. Lightfoot's hands, compared to what it was before it came into them. I have elsewhere spoken of his treatment of the Ignatian question as in a manner "final," not because I do not believe that there are portions of it, especially those relating to the constitution of the Church, on which more may be discovered and more precise views obtained, but because the main points—the priority of the shorter recension of seven letters and the genuineness of these seven letters with that of Polycarp—will never need to be reopened. Another fixed point has been won for criticism, which it may use as a base for further operations. In the obscure period to which it belongs any such fixed point is of inestimable value. Indeed there are few whose attention has been drawn to that period who will not feel that light is beginning to dawn around them as it had never dawned before.

It will easily be imagined that the qualities which Dr. Lightfoot had shown so conspicuously in criticism, taken together with the remarkable influence which he had exercised at Cambridge, gave a sure guarantee of his capacity to fill the highest places in the Church; and, after doing in the nineteenth century a work which if not exactly similar was parallel to that which Bp. Butler did in the eighteenth, he was called to occupy Bp. Butler's see. The result of this and of some other appointments is, that whereas a few years ago the English bench was somewhat weak in point of learning, at the present moment it is exceptionally strong.

Judgment with Bp. Lightfoot is not by any means a merely passive quality. It is not timidity; it is not temporizing. The Bishop is thoroughly capable of firm and strong action when the occasion arises. The habit of mind which I have been describing would naturally prevent him from

taking rash action at the beginning of his episcopate ; but he has never been wanting to good causes, and public confidence has perceptibly risen since it has been known that his unwavering integrity of purpose, his manly simplicity of character, and his broad judicial mind have been brought directly to bear upon the counsels of the Church.

5. *Lucidity of Style.* I have reserved until last the quality which is of all others perhaps the most distinctive of Dr. Lightfoot, as a writer. If one glances over the roll of illustrious names among the critics and exegetes of Europe and America, there are many who can lay claim to learning, many also who go to work on approved methods ; there are some who possess high scholarship, and some more of sound judgment ; but among them all there is none who comes near to Dr. Lightfoot in lucidity of exposition. The lucidity is perfect ; it is hardly possible to conceive it going further. I choose the word purposely as implying something more than “clearness” or “precision.” The best American scholars have both these qualities in a high degree ; but they have not quite the literary finish which goes to convert them into “lucidity.” M. Renan has the literary finish, but it is finish of a rather different kind ; it has perhaps a higher æsthetic or poetic quality, but it wants the fundamental clearness and precision of thought. M. Renan’s sentences are bright with a golden or pearly haze : they are beautiful, but their object is not to define or develop in logical sequence. This is what Bp. Lightfoot does so inimitably. Paley comes nearest of English writers ; but Paley had not quite the breadth which comes from profound learning, from fulness of matter.

It seems to me that as a critic Bp. Lightfoot’s style is absolutely ideal. For myself, as a matter of personal taste, I do not like his pulpit oratory quite so well. The orderly development of a subject is there, and is often

most artistic. But he seems to me to yield just a little too much to the popular demand for eloquence. I remember once how a quotation from Bp. Butler seemed to stand out in bare impressiveness all the more for its rather florid setting. Bp. Lightfoot, I think, is at his best in *historical* sermons. There his natural breadth of treatment is in place; he fills his canvas like Veronese, and masses his lights and shades like Tintoret. It has also been my privilege to hear some of his private addresses to candidates for ordination. There the simplicity of the man came out in urging simplicity, and his reality in enforcing reality, in a way that I shall not soon forget.

About midway between his style as a critic and as a preacher (and it should be remembered that I have tried to judge the latter by the highest standards), I should be inclined to place his style as an exegete. Admirable in the extreme, it has always seemed to me, are the paraphrases which Bp. Lightfoot interweaves with his commentary. These alone are a commentary in themselves. I can imagine it being thought that Bp. Lightfoot was not profound as a commentator; but that is only because his mind rejects all that it has not thoroughly assimilated: it will meddle with nothing but what it can express with perfect clearness. Any one who thinks that Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries are deficient in depth might be advised to read the short section on the *Character and Contents* of the Epistle to the Colossians. If this is wanting in depth, so too is Athanasius.

At the same time, it must be admitted that Dr. Lightfoot has not exactly the gift which makes Bengel such a model for commentators. He is *too* clear; he reveals too much; the thought is not so concentrated and compressed. "Suggestive" is not the word that we should apply to Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries. His sentences are not like those (*e.g.*) of St. Augustine, where lightning flashes out

of the cloud. There is a force behind them, but it is force that has been tamed and composed : there is nothing about it volcanic or eruptive. It is however a rare mood when we desire to see these convulsions of nature, this "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep." We should hardly go to a modern commentary for anything Titanic. Enceladus under Etna seems a fable of the past. Fortunately there are "diversities of gifts," and our wisdom is to enjoy those of one man without complaining that they are not those of another. Bp. Lightfoot in an early article quotes a passage which justly blames that "tyrannous desire for uniformity, which confounds the judgment of men, when they are commenting upon each other. . . . ; so that you often find that a long criticism upon a man, or his works, is but a demand that he should be somebody else, and his work somebody else's work" (*Journal of Philology*, iv. p. 84, from *Spanish Conquest in America*, i. p. 275). This is what we should avoid. At the same time, it is no disparagement to place Bp. Lightfoot with all his varied accomplishments, as an exegete, a step below Bengel, though most of us will probably learn much more from him of the two.

I seem to myself to discern a certain growth in Bp. Lightfoot's commentaries considered strictly as commentaries. I have spoken of the remarkable maturity of scholarship which was displayed in his earliest work ; but the maturity was mainly of scholarship, of knowledge, of all that appertains to externals. It was not quite that prolonged wrestling with the thought of a writer, which not only gets at his secret, but makes you feel that it is his secret—a central moving force, which does not itself appear upon the surface, though its effects are seen all along the surface. It seems to me, if I am not mistaken, that there is more of this in the Commentary on Colossians than in that on Galatians ; and, if it is so, it would

naturally be explained by continued study and closer personal acquaintance with the author.

Of all the great commentators, Bp. Lightfoot perhaps reminds us most of Chrysostom. Allowance being made for the fact that Chrysostom's Homilies were for the most part either delivered from the pulpit or written with the object of being so delivered, and allowing also for the fact that Chrysostom was not only a commentator but a born preacher, there is something, as it seems to me, distinctly parallel in the character of the two minds. Both have the same brightness, clearness, and fulness—which is yet not redundancy—of exposition. Both have the same natural repulsion to anything obscure, which makes them perhaps do not quite the fullest justice to obscurity. The rugged, tortuous, embarrassed, and struggling language of St. Paul is so smoothed out that one seems to lose something of the impressiveness of his mental force and stature. The gain no doubt is immense. Probably no Englishman has done so much to make the Apostle's meaning clear to the Englishspeaking peoples. This is the first and paramount duty of a commentator; and it is not perhaps easy to see how it could be combined with what is almost an opposite function—the function of bringing home with equal insistence the extraordinary difficulties, and extraordinary efforts in contending with his difficulties, of this mighty coiner of new ideas, fetched as it would seem at one moment from the lowest deeps, and at another moment from the third heaven. All that I would say is, after reading St. Paul with Bp. Lightfoot, it is well to read him again without any such aid, if only to get a more thorough idea of the man. The best of mediums is yet a medium. The very light itself may alter and dwarf, while it illuminates. Even Wordsworth's cliff, "familiar with forgotten years," would look less grand in the blaze of a summer's sun.

I should not be at all surprised if these remarks should seem to my readers exceedingly obvious. One who has the gift of clearness to such an extent as Bp. Lightfoot, will necessarily leave a clear impression of himself upon others. I can only hope to help the reader to realize more fully the conception already existing in his own mind. He will do this perhaps if he will first think of the points which I have mentioned separately, and then think of them in combination. Generalities that seem in themselves vague, become less vague when several of them are viewed in connexion. It is not my business now to attempt to characterize the other great leaders of contemporary theology. But supposing that the simple tests which I have been applying to Bp. Lightfoot were applied to them, I think it would be seen how first one and then another would differentiate themselves. One possesses this quality and not that; or this in a high, and that in a subordinate degree. What is perhaps most remarkable about Bp. Lightfoot is the even balance and due proportion in which various characteristics unite in him. With the many-sided learning and scientific methods of the nineteenth century, he combines an attitude and quality of mind that reminds one rather of the eighteenth. The eighteenth century was pre-eminently the age of completeness, balance of parts, lucidity. It was the age of simple, unaffected, moral enthusiasms. What it wanted perhaps was a stronger sense of the mystery of things, "the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world." Something of that more awestruck, wondering and aspiring temper the nineteenth century has brought, but along with it how much that is crude, vapid sickly, sentimental! Have not these vices penetrated our Churches and our theology, as well as our fashions, our poetry and our art? And if so, is it not an immense debt that we owe to a man like Bp. Lightfoot, who is the direct antithesis of all that I have just named? That is a happy

age which along with a distinct individuality of its own, with certain excellences which are not exactly shared by other ages, carries in its bosom the corrective for the "defects of its qualities." And can we not truly say that we possess such a corrective? Imagine the spirit of Bp. Lightfoot combined with the spirit of Cardinal Newman. There is surely no reason in the nature of things why it should not be combined. Germany has certainly beaten us in the scientific collection of materials. We use these materials with less shame, and sometimes, I am afraid, with less acknowledgment, than we ought. Germany has twenty workers where we have one. But I doubt if Germany has produced such leaders of men. I doubt if Germany, with all its thinking power, has such inspiring figures to contemplate. There needs a touch of something more than thought and knowledge and science before it is possible to achieve the highest in religion. In England, at least since the Tractarian movement began, there has been more of that fugitive and evanescent quality than of solid material for it to work on. Now, thanks more than any one else to Bp. Lightfoot and his Cambridge compeers, we are beginning to accumulate such material. Meantime the old spirit is not dead, and I sincerely trust that it will not die. The clouds seem to be gathering over our country. Anxious times, in more ways than one, are before us. But in the department of theology it is impossible not to cherish a lively hope, and in what is of more importance still than theology, in the whole sphere of religion.

W. SANDAY.

THE PROPHECIES OF ST. PAUL.

I.—1 AND 2 THESSALONIANS.

THE whole teaching, whether oral or written, of the Apostles of the New Testament, was essentially prophetic. St. Paul, in entire harmony with the Old Testament conception, defines a prophet to be one who “knows mysteries and knowledge” (1 Cor. xiii. 2) and “speaks to men edification and exhortation and consolation” (1 Cor. xiv. 3). This is a fair description of his own work; his Epistles are full of mysteries and knowledge, and speak to men edification, strengthening, and comfort. Among the mysteries which they declare—the word, we must remember, does not denote something inherently inscrutable, but only something as yet unknown and needing to be revealed—there are not lacking some that have to do with the future. We may properly speak, therefore, of Paul’s prophecies, even in that narrow sense in which the word is popularly used, and which makes it synonymous with predictions. It is in this sense, indeed, although under a mild protest, that we use it in these papers. Our purpose is to study the predictions of Paul.

We begin with his earliest writings, the Epistles to the Thessalonians, which were written at Corinth in A.D. 52 and 53. As is well known to every careful reader of the New Testament, these Epistles are also the richest in predictions of all Paul’s writings. It is not too much to say that their main burden is the Coming of the Lord. To explanations concerning this, their only didactic portions are given; and, in the first Epistle at least, a constant allusion to it is woven like a golden thread throughout its whole texture, and each section, whatever its subject, is sure to reach its climax in a reference to it (i. 10; ii. 19;

iii. 13; v. 23). This seems strange to some. And it has been suggested, either that the Apostle in his early ministry made more of the Second Advent in his teaching than growing wisdom permitted him to do later; or else, that at this particular period, amid the special trials of his work—the persecutions in Macedonia, the chill indifference at Athens, the discouragements that met him at Corinth—he had his heart turned more than was usual with him to the blessed consolation of a Christian's expectation of the coming glory. Both of these explanations are entirely gratuitous. A sufficient reason for this marked peculiarity lies at the hand of all in that other fact that distinguishes these letters from all their fellows—they are the only letters that have come down to us, which were addressed to an infant community just emerged from heathenism.

For it is undeniable that the staple of Paul's preaching to the Gentiles was God and the Judgment. When addressing Jews he could appeal to prophecy, and he preached Jesus to them as Him whom all the prophets pointed unto, the Messiah whom God had graciously promised. But with Gentiles he could appeal only to conscience; and he preached Jesus to them as Him through whom God would judge the world in righteousness, whereof He hath given assurance to all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead. The address on the Areopagus, which was delivered only a few months before 1 Thessalonians was written, admirably illustrates how the Apostle tried to reach the consciences of his heathen hearers; and the totality of the message delivered in it was God (Acts xvii. 24–29) and the Judgment (Acts xvii. 30, 31). But if Christ coming for judgment was thus the very centre and substance of Paul's proclamation to the Gentiles, it would not be strange if he had dwelt upon it to the Thessalonians also. And that he had preached just in this strain to them, when, so shortly before writing this letter, he was with them, he tells us him-

self (1 Thess. i. 9, 10). For, what he chiefly thanks God for in their case is that they "turned unto God from idols" in order to do two things:—"serve the living and true God," and "await patiently His Son from the heavens, whom He raised from the dead, Jesus, our deliverer from the coming wrath." The parallel with the speech on Mars' Hill is precise; it almost looks as if the Apostle had repeated at Athens the sermon that had been so effective at Thessalonica.

But we not only learn thus how it happens that Paul dwells so much on the Second Advent when writing to the Thessalonians, but we learn also what is much more important,—how he himself thought of the Advent and in what aspect he proclaimed it. Plainly to him it was above all things else the Judgment. It was the Judgment Day that he announced in its proclamation; and this was the lever with which he prized at Gentile consciences. "The day in which God will judge the world in righteousness" was what he proclaimed to the Athenians, and that it was just this that was in mind in 1 Thess. i. 10 is evident from the office assigned to the expected Jesus,—“the Deliverer from the coming wrath.” In harmony with this, every passage in which the Second Advent is adverted to in these Epistles conceives of it pointedly as the Judgment Day. The Apostle's eager desire for the purity and sanctification of his readers is always referred to the Advent: he wishes to have them to boast of before the Lord Jesus at His coming (1 Thess ii. 19),—he prays that their hearts may be established unblameworthy in holiness before God at the coming of our Lord Jesus (1 Thess. iii. 13),—he beseeches the God of peace to preserve them in their whole being and all their faculties blameless, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. v. 23),—he declares that the Day of the Lord will bring sudden destruction upon the wicked (1 Thess. v. 3), and will draw a sharp line in justice between

the good and bad (2 Thess. i. 9). He speaks of the Advent freely as the "Day of the Lord" (1 Thess v. 2, 4; 2 Thess. i. 10), a term which from Joel down had stood in all prophecy as the synonym of the final judgment.

The most important passage in this point of view is 2 Thess. i. 6-10, where the matter is not only treated at large, but the statements are explicit. Here the declaration is distinctly made that "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven (*ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει*) together with the angels of His power, in a fire of flame," God will justly recompense affliction to those who persecuted the Thessalonians, and rest or relief to them. Both the statement of what is to occur and the definition of the time when it is to occur are to be here observed; and as the one can refer to nothing else than the distribution of rewards and punishments for the deeds done in the body, so the other can have no other reference than to the act of the coming of Christ. Both matters are made even plainer by what follows. The Apostle proceeds to declare broadly that this revelation of Jesus of which he is speaking is as one giving vengeance to those ignorant of God and those disobedient to the gospel—a vengeance that comes in the way of justice, and consists in eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might. And so closely and even carefully is the time defined, that to the exact statement that all this occurs at the revelation of Christ from heaven, it is added at the end, that this "eternal destruction" takes place whenever (*ὅταν*) the Lord gloriously comes,—"*at that day.*" Unless the Apostle is here representing the persecutors of the Thessalonians as partakers in the horrors of the punitive side of the Second Advent because he expected and here asserts that the Advent was to come before that generation passed away—and this will not satisfy the general representation of verses 8 *seq.*—it is certain that he here thinks of the Advent, considered

as an act and not as a state, as the last judgment itself, when

“Nil inultum remanebit.”

In this case it would presuppose a general resurrection.

That Paul had a resurrection in mind as accompanying the Second Advent is certain from another important passage (1 Thess. iv. 13-18). The Thessalonians did not doubt that Jesus had risen from the dead (v. 14); but they had not realized even in thought all the consequences of this great fact. Like certain at a somewhat later date at Corinth, they did not understand that all men that die rise again by virtue of Christ's conquest of death. And thus, as they saw one and another of their own number “fall on sleep,” they sorrowed inordinately over them, like the rest that have no hope. It is not exactly clear what they thought of the state of the dead,—whether they conceived of them as with Christ indeed, in Paradise, but condemned to an eternity of shade existence, separated from the body for ever, which seems to have been the case with their Corinthian fellow-errorists,—or whether they fancied that with the cessation of bodily activity, the whole life went out, as may be hinted in the sad words that they sorrowed as the rest who have no hope (v. 13). In either case the Apostle brings them quick consolation in the glad announcement that the resurrection of Christ implies that of those who have fallen asleep; and that, raised through Jesus, God will bring them with Him at His coming (v. 14). With this assurance he makes Christ's coming doubly precious to them. Then proceeding to more minute details, he declares that those who are alive and are left unto the coming of the Lord shall in no wise be beforehand with those who have fallen asleep; for the Lord will come with a shout, and with an archangel's voice, and with a blast of the trumpet of God, which will pierce even into the grave. Thus the rising of Christ's

dead is secured before He reaches the earth; and only after they have joined the throng, are the living along with them to be caught up in (or on) clouds unto His meeting, —into the air, to “swell the triumph of His train.” “So,” adds the Apostle, “we shall be always with the Lord” (v. 17). Dire, then, as the coming will be to those who know not God and who obey not the gospel, it will be bliss unspeakable to those in Christ; and as the results, on the one side, are “eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might” (2 Thess. i. 9); so on the other they will be eternal dwelling with the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 17). It goes without saying that the Apostle has the believing dead only in his mind in our present passage (v. 16). How could he in such a passage speak of any other? But is not the parallel too close for us not to suspect that, as in the one case both the living and dead in Christ shall partake in the bliss and the living shall not precede the dead, so in the other the living who are left unto the Coming shall not precede those who have passed away, in receiving the terrible doom, and that the blare of the trumpet of God veritably

“Coget omnes ante thronum”?

Or is it more probable that Paul believed and taught that the Lord would certainly come before that generation passed away? There is no room to doubt that the Thessalonians expected the Advent in their own time. Their feelings towards death (1 Thess. iv. 13 *seq.*) would be otherwise inexplicable. And it is worthy of note that the Apostle does not correct them in this belief. He points out to them that to fall asleep was not to miss the glory of the Advent, but that whether they waked or slept they should live together with their Lord (1 Thess. v. 10). But he says no word that would declare them mistaken in expecting to live until “that day.” On the contrary, he

expresses himself in terms that left the possibility open that the Lord might come while they were still alive and left on the earth (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17). This was far from asserting that the Lord would come in that generation; but, in the connexion in which the words stand, they would have been impossible had the Apostle felt justified in asserting that He would not come. And this appears to be the exact difference between the attitude of the Thessalonians and that of Paul; they confidently expected the Lord in their own day—he was in complete uncertainty when He would come. That He would assuredly come, to bring sudden destruction (1 Thess. v. 3) upon all appointed unto wrath (v. 9) and rest and salvation to those in Christ, he was sure; but the times and seasons he knew perfectly were hidden in the Father's power (1 Thess. v. 1). He might come soon—when He did come, it would be, he knew, with the unexpectedness of a thief in the night (1 Thess. v. 2). But meanwhile, whether it found him waking or sleeping was of no moment; and though it became him to watch (1 Thess. v. 6), yet the watch was to be not a nervous expectancy, but a quiet and patient waiting (1 Thess. i. 10, *ἀναμένειν*, cf. Judith viii. 17). But if, just because the “when” was unknown, the Apostle could not confidently expect the Lord in his own time, the categorical assertion that the Advent would bring “eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord” (2 Thess. i. 9) to the special persecutors of the Thessalonians, rests on his view of the Advent as synchronous with the final judgment and presupposes a general resurrection.

The very moderation of the Apostle's attitude made it difficult for the excited Thessalonians to yield themselves to his leading. Certainly his first letter did not allay their fanaticism. Things went rather from bad to worse, and so certain were they that the Lord was coming at once, that they fell an easy prey to every one who should

ery "Lo, here!" or "Lo, there!" and even, apparently from this cause, began to neglect their daily business and became mere busybodies, refusing to work, and eating the bread of others. The Apostle sternly rebukes their disorder, and commands that they work with quietness; and with a view to preserving them from sudden agitation whenever any one chose to declare "The day of the Lord is upon us!" he points out certain events that must come before the Lord. That this practical, ethical purpose was the occasion of the important revelation in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12, the Apostle tells us himself (v. 2). And a simple glance at his words is enough to expose the almost ludicrous inappropriateness of the contention of some that the error of the Thessalonians was not feverish expectancy of the Lord's coming, but the belief that the day of the Lord had already come and had brought none of the blessings they had expected from it,—not the Lord Himself, nor their resurrected friends,—nothing of all that the Apostle had taught and they had hoped.¹ What the Apostle says is that he wishes to save them from being suddenly shaken from their senses or troubled by any statement from any quarter, as that the day of the Lord was upon them. The passage is parallel to and probably founded upon the words of our Lord in His warning to His disciples not to be led astray or deceived by any "who should say, 'Lo, here is the Christ!' or 'Here!'" (Matt.

¹ This curious misinterpretation is founded on a pressure of the verb ἐνέστη-
κεν, v. 2, in forgetfulness of three things. (1) That this verb is a compound
of ἵστημι, not of εἶμι, and means, not "is in progress," but "is upon us," in
the two senses of "to threaten," and "to be actual" (especially in the par-
tiple). While it *may* mean "to be present," therefore, it *need not* mean it,
and is not likely to in such a case. (2) That the clause "either by spirit or
by word, or by letter as if from us," is an essential part of the context, the
omission of which falsifies the text. What the Apostle says is *not* "be not
troubled—as that the day of the Lord," etc., *but* "be not troubled *by any*
statement as that the day of the Lord is upon us!"—something essentially
different, which excludes the above interpretation. (3) That the broad context
renders this explanation impossible and meaningless.

xxiv. 23), and is already a valuable indication that throughout this whole section Paul has the great apocalyptic discourse of Jesus in mind and is to be interpreted from it.

The impression has become very widespread that, owing to the lack on our part of the previous information to which Paul alludes as given by him on a former occasion to the Thessalonians (verses 5 and 6), the interpretation of this prophecy must remain for all time a sealed riddle to us. That two important events, called by Paul "the apostasy," and "the revelation of the man of sin," the latter of which was at the time deterred by something else mysteriously designated "the restraint," or "the restrainer," were to take place before the coming of the Lord—this, we are told, is all that we can know, and any effort to obtain any defined outlines for the misty shapes thus barely named to us only succeeds in bringing the dense darkness in which they are steeped into tangibility and visibility. We find it difficult to believe the matter so hopeless. On the contrary, the broad outlines, at least, of the prophecy appear to us sufficiently clear; and we believe that a sound method of study will give the humble student who is willing to put a stern check on his imagination and follow the leading of the exegetical hints alone, an adequately exact understanding of its chief details.

First of all, we must try to keep fresh in our minds the great principle that all prophecy is ethical in its purpose, and that this ethical end controls not only what shall be revealed in general, but also the details of it and the very form which it takes. Next, we must not fail to observe that our present prophecy is not independent of previous ones,—that its roots are in Daniel, and from beginning to end it is full of allusions to our Lord's great apocalyptic discourse. Still again, we must bear in mind that it comes from a hand which throughout these Epistles preserves an

attitude of uncertainty of the "times and seasons," and so expresses himself as to imply that he believed that the Lord might come, in despite of all these preliminary events, in his own day.

If, holding fast to these principles, we approach the prophecy itself, we observe first of all, that although the three things—the Apostasy, the Revelation of the Man of Sin, and the Coming of the Lord—are brought together, they are not declared to be closely connected, or immediately consecutive to one another. The mere "and" of verse 3 reveals nothing beyond the simple fact that both of those events must come to pass before the Lord comes. So too for all that the prophecy tells us, both of these evil developments might come and pass away, and be succeeded by ages on ages which in turn might pass away, and yet men be able to say, "Where is the promise of His coming?" To point to the declaration in verse 8, that "the Lord Jesus shall destroy" the lawless one—almost, "blow him away"—"with the breath of His mouth and abolish him with the manifestation of His presence," as proving that he will still be lording it on earth when the Lord comes to his destruction, is to neglect the apparent indications of the context. For this assertion does not go, in either vividness or literality of expression, beyond what is stated just before of the generation then living (2 Thess. i. 7, 9); and it is inserted here not as a chronological detail—and is out of place (cf. verses 9, *seq.*) if considered a chronological detail—but as part of the description of the lawless one, and for the ethical purpose of keeping in the mind of the reader his judgment by God and his final fate. In a word, this statement only declares of the Man of Sin what was just before declared of the lesser enemies of the Gospel, and what was in 1 Thess. v. 3 *seq.* declared of all to whom wrath is appointed—that he shall meet with destruction at the Second Coming of the Lord. The revelation of the Man of Sin is not, then,

necessarily to be sought at the end of time: we know of it, only that it will succeed the removal of the "restraint," and precede, by how much we are not told, the coming of the Lord.

We cannot fail to observe, however, next, that in his description of the Man of Sin, the Apostle has a contemporary, or nearly contemporary phenomenon in mind. The withholding power is already present. Although the Man of Sin is not yet revealed, as a mystery his essential "lawlessness" is already working—"only until the present restrainer be removed from the midst." He expects him to sit in "the temple of God," which perhaps most naturally refers to the literal temple in Jerusalem, although the Apostle knew that the out-pouring of God's wrath on the Jews was close at hand (1 Thess. ii. 16). And if we compare the description which the Apostle gives of him with our Lord's address on the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxiv.), to which, as we have already hinted, Paul makes obvious allusion, it becomes at once in the highest degree probable that in the words, "he that exalteth himself against all that is called God, or is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the sanctuary of God showing himself that he is God," Paul can have nothing else in view than what our Lord described as "the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place" (Matt. xxiv. 15); and this our Lord connects immediately with the beleaguering of Jerusalem (cf. Luke xxi. 20). This obvious parallel, however, not only places the revelation of the Man of Sin in the near future, but goes far towards leading us to his exact identification. Our Lord's words not only connect him with the siege of Jerusalem, but place him distinctly among the besiegers; and, led by the implication of the original setting of the phrase (in Dan. xi. 36) which Paul uses, we cannot go far wrong in identifying him with the Roman emperor.

Whether a single emperor was thought of or the line of emperors, is a more difficult question. The latter hypothesis will best satisfy the conditions of the problem; and we believe that the line of emperors, considered as the embodiment of persecuting power, is the revelation of iniquity hidden under the name of the Man of Sin. With this is connected in the description certain other traits of Roman imperialism—more especially the rage for deification, which, in the person of Caligula, had already given a foretaste of what was to come. It was Nero, then, the first persecutor of the Church,—and Vespasian the miracle-worker,¹—and Titus, who introduced his divine-self and his idolatrous insignia into the Holy of Holies, perhaps with a directly anti-Christian intent,²—and Domitian,—and the whole line of human monsters whom the world was worshipping as gods, on which, as a nerve-cord of evil, these hideous ganglia gathered,—these and such as these it was that Paul had in mind when he penned this hideous description of the son of perdition, every item of which was fulfilled in the terrible story of the emperors of Rome.

The restraining power, on this hypothesis, appears to be the Jewish state. For the continued existence of the Jewish state was both graciously and naturally a protection to Christianity, and hence a restraint on the revelation of the persecuting power. Graciously, it was God's plan to develop Christianity under the protection of Judaism for a short set time, with the double purpose of keeping the door of salvation open to the Jews until all of their elect of that generation should be gathered in and the apostasy of the nation should be rendered doubly and trebly without excuse, and of hiding the tender infancy of the Church within the canopy of a protecting sheath until it should grow strong enough to withstand all storms. Naturally,

¹ Tac., *Hist.*, iv. 82; Suet., *Vesp.*, 7; Dion. Cass., lxxvi. 8.

² Sulp. Sev., *Sacr. Hist.*, ii. 30. § 6. 7.

the effect of the continuance of Judaism was to conceal Christianity from notice through a confusion of it with Judaism—to save it thus from being declared an illicit religion—and to enable it to grow strong under the protection accorded to Jewish worship. So soon as the Jewish apostasy was complete and Jerusalem given over to the Gentiles—God deserting the temple which was no longer His temple to the fury of the enemies, of those who were now His enemies—the separation of Christianity from Judaism, which had already begun, became evident to every eye; the conflict between the new faith and heathenism culminating in and now alive almost only in the Emperor-worship, became intense; and the persecuting power of the empire was inevitably let loose. Thus the continued existence of Judaism was in the truest sense a restraint on the persecution of Christians, and its destruction gave the signal for the lawless one to be revealed in his time.

If the masculine form of “the restrainer” in verse 7 demands interpretation as a person—which we more than doubt—it might possibly be referred without too great pressure to James of Jerusalem, God’s chosen instrument in keeping the door of Christianity open for the Jews and by so doing continuing and completing their probation. Thus he may be said to have been the upholder of the restraining power, the savour of the salt that preserved the Christians from persecution, and so in a high sense the restrainer.

Finally, in this interpretation, the apostasy is obviously the great apostasy of the Jews, gradually filling up all these years and hastening to its completion in their destruction. That the Apostle certainly had this rapidly completing apostasy in his mind in the severe arraignment that he makes of the Jews in 1 Thess. ii. 14–16, which reached its climax in the declaration that they were continually filling

up more and more full the measure of their sins, until already the measure of God's wrath was prematurely (ἐφθα-σεν) filled up against them and was hanging over them like some laden thunder-cloud ready to burst and overwhelm them,—adds an additional reason for supposing his reference to be to this apostasy—above all others, “the” apostasy—in this passage.

We venture to think that the core of this interpretation may be accounted very probable,—so much of it as this: that the Apostle had in view in this prophecy a development in the immediate future closely connected with the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem, although not as if that were the coming of Christ for which he was patiently waiting, but rather in full recognition of its being only the culmination of the Jewish apostasy and the falling of God's wrath upon them to the uttermost. When he declares that these events must precede the coming of Christ, this no doubt was clear evidence that the Advent was not to be looked for immediately; but was in no wise inconsistent with uncertainty whether it would come during that generation or not. As a matter of mere fact the growing apostasy of the Jews was completed—the abomination of desolation had been set up in the sanctuary—Jerusalem and the temple, and the Jewish state were in ruins—Christianity stood naked before her enemies—and the persecuting sword of Divus Cæsar was unsheathed and Paul had himself felt its keenness: all the prophecy had been fulfilled before two decades had passed away.

Let us gather up for the close, in brief recapitulation, the events which Paul predicts in these two Epistles. First of all, and most persistently of all, he predicts the coming of the Lord from heaven unto judgment, with its glorious accompaniments of hosts of angels, the shout, the voice of the archangel and the blast of the trumpet of God that awake the dead. Thus, he predicts the resurrection of

Christ's dead to partake in the glory of His coming. Then, he foretells the results of the judgment—eternal destruction from the face of God for the wicked, and everlasting presence with the Lord for His own. Of the time of the Advent the Apostle professes ignorance; he only knows that it will come unexpectedly. But he does know that before it the apostasy of the Jews must be completed, and the persecuting power of the Roman state be revealed. This apostasy and its punishment he sees is immediately ready for completion (1 Thess. ii. 16). Finally, he mentions having previously foretold the persecutions under which the Thessalonians were already suffering (1 Thess. iii. 4).

Allegheny.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XVIII.

SLAYING SELF THE FOUNDATION PRECEPT OF PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY.

“Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, the which is idolatry; for which things’ sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience; in the which ye also walked aforetime, when ye lived in these things. But now put ye also away all these; anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth: lie not one to another”—COL. iii. 5-9 (Rev. Vers.).

“MORTIFY *therefore*”—wherefore? The previous words give the reason. Because “ye died” with Christ, and because ye “were raised together with Him.” In other words, the plainest, homeliest moral teaching of this Epistle, such as that which immediately follows, is built upon its “mystical” theology. Paul thinks that the deep things which he has been saying about union with Christ in his death and resurrection have the most intimate connexion

with common life. These profound truths have the keenest edge, and are as a sacrificial knife, to slay the life of self. Creed is meant to tell on conduct. Character is the last outcome and test of doctrine. But too many people deal with their theological beliefs as they do with their hassocks and prayer books and hymn books in their pews—use them for formal worship once a week, and leave them for the dust to settle on them till Sunday comes round again. So it is very necessary to put the practical inferences very plainly, to reiterate the most commonplace and threadbare precepts as the issue of the most recondite teaching, and to bind the burden of duty on men's backs with the cords of principles and doctrines.

Accordingly the section of the Epistle which deals with Christian character now begins, and this "therefore" knits the two halves together. That word protests against opposite errors. On the one hand, some good people are to be found impatient of exhortations to duties, and ready to say, Preach the gospel, and the duties will spring up spontaneously where it is received; on the other hand, some people are to be found who see no connexion between the practice of common morality and the belief of Christian truths, and are ready to say, Put away your theology; it is useless lumber, the machine will work as well without it. But Paul believed that the firmest basis for moral teaching and the most powerful motive for moral conduct is "the truth as it is in Jesus."

I. We have here put very plainly the paradox of continual self-slaying as the all-embracing duty of a Christian.

It is a pity that the R. V. has retained "mortify" here, as that Latinized word says to an ordinary reader much less than is meant, and hides the allusion to the preceding contest. The marginal alternative "make dead" is, to say the least, not idiomatic English. The suggestion of the American revisers, which is printed at the end of the R. V.,

“put to death,” is much better, and perhaps a single word, such as “slay” or “kill,” might have been better still.

“Slay your members which are upon the earth.” It is a vehement and paradoxical injunction, though it be but the echo of still more solemn and stringent words—“pluck it out, cut it off, and cast it from thee.” The possibility of misunderstanding it and bringing it down to the level of that spurious asceticism and “severity to the body” against which he has just been thundering, seems to occur to the Apostle, and therefore he hastens to explain that he does not mean the maiming of selves, or hacking away limbs, but the slaying of the passions and desires which root themselves in our bodily constitution. The eager haste of the explanation destroys the congruity of the sentence, but he does not mind that. And then follows a grim catalogue of the evil-doers on whom sentence of death is passed.

Before dealing with that list, two points of some importance may be observed. The first is that the practical exhortations of this letter begin with this command to put off certain characteristics which are assumed to belong to the Colossian Christians in their natural state, and that only afterwards comes the precept to put on (ver. 12) the fairer robes of Christlike purity, clasped about by the girdle of perfectness. That is to say, Paul’s anthropology regards men as wrong and having to get right. A great deal of the moral teaching which is outside of Christianity, and which does not sufficiently recognise that the first thing to be done is to cure and alter, but talks as if men were, on the whole, rather inclined to be good, is for that very reason perfectly useless. Its fine precepts and lofty sentiments go clean over people’s heads, and are ludicrously inappropriate to the facts of the case. The serpent has twined itself round me, and unless you can give me a knife, sharp and strong enough to cut its loathsome coils asunder, it is cruel to bid me walk. There is not a man, woman or child on the

face of the earth who does not need, for moral progress, to be shown and helped first how *not* to be what he or she has been, and only after that is it of the slightest use to tell them what they ought to be. The only thing that reaches the universal need is a power that will make us different from what we are. If we are to grow into goodness and beauty, we must begin by a complete reversal of tastes and tendencies. The thing we want first is not progress, the going on in the direction in which our faces are turned, but a power which can lay a mastering hand upon our shoulders, turn us right round, and make us go in the way opposite to that. Culture, the development of what is in us in germ, is not the beginning of good husbandry on human nature as it is. The thorns have to be stubbed up first, and the poisonous seeds sifted out, and new soil laid down, and then culture will bring forth something better than wild grapes. First—"mortify;" then—"put on."

Another point to be carefully noted is that, according to the Apostle's teaching, the root and beginning of all such slaying of the evil which is in us all, lies in our being dead with Christ to the world. In the former chapter we found that the Apostle's final condemnation of the false asceticism which was beginning to infest the Colossian Church, was that it was of no value as a counteractive of fleshly indulgence. But here he proclaims that what asceticism could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, that union with Jesus Christ in His death and risen life will do; it will subdue sin in the flesh. That slaying here enjoined as fundamental to all Christian holiness, is but the working out in life and character of the revolution in the inmost self which has been effected, if by faith we are joined to the living Lord, who was dead and is alive for evermore.

There must, however, be a very vigorous act of personal determination if the power of that union is to be manifested in us. The act of "slaying" can never be pleasant or easy.

The vehemence of the command and the form of the metaphor express the strenuousness of the effort and the painfulness of the process, in the same way as Paul's other saying, "crucify the flesh," does. Suppose a man working at some machine. His fingers get drawn between the rollers or caught in some belting. Another minute and he will be flattened to a shapeless bloody mass. He catches up an axe lying by and with his own arm hacks off his own hand at the wrist. It takes some nerve to do that. It is not easy nor pleasant, but it is the only alternative to a horrible death. I know of no stimulus that will string a man up to the analogous spiritual act here enjoined, and enjoined by conscience also, except participation in the death of Christ and in the resulting life.

"Slay your members which are upon the earth" means tears and blood and more than blood. It is easier far to cut off the hand which after all is not me, than to sacrifice passions and desires which, though they be my worst self, are myself. It is useless to blink the fact that the only road to holiness is through self-suppression, self-annihilation, and nothing can make that easy and pleasant. True, the paths of religion are ways of pleasantness and paths of peace, but they are steep, and climbing is never easy. The upper air is bracing and exhilarating indeed, but trying to lungs accustomed to the low levels. Religion is delightful, but self-denial is always against the grain of the self which is denied, and there is no religion without it. Holiness is not to be won in a moment. It is not a matter of consciousness, possessed when we know that we possess it. But it has to be attained by effort. The way to heaven is not by "the primrose path." That leads to "the everlasting bonfire." For ever it remains true that men *obtain* forgiveness and eternal life as a gift for which the only requisite is faith, but they *achieve* holiness, which is the permeating of their characters with that eternal life, by

patient, believing, continuous effort. An essential part of that effort is directed towards the conquest and casting out of the old self in its earthward-looking lusts and passions. The love of Jesus Christ and the indwelling of His renewing spirit make that conquest possible, by supplying an all-constraining motive and an all-conquering power. But even they do not make it easy, nor deaden the flesh to the cut of the sacrificial knife.

II. We have here a grim catalogue of the condemned to death.

The Apostle stands like a gaoler at the prison door, with the fatal roll in his hand, and reads out the names of the evil doers for whom the tumbril waits to carry them to the guillotine. It is an ugly list, but we need plain speaking that there may be no mistake as to the identity of the culprits. He enumerates evils which honeycombed society with rottenness then, and are rampant now. The series recounts various forms of evil love, and is so arranged as that it starts with the coarse, gross act, and goes on to more subtle and inward forms. It goes up the stream as it were, to the fountain head, passing inward from deed to desire. First stands "fornication," which covers the whole ground of immoral sexual relations, then "all uncleanness," which embraces every manifestation in word, or look or deed of the impure spirit, and so is at once wider and subtler than the gross physical act. Then follow "passion" and "evil desire"; the sources of the evil deeds. These again are at once more inward and more general than the preceding. They include not only the lusts and longings which give rise to the special sins just denounced, but to all forms of hungry appetite and desire after "the things that are upon the earth." If we are to try to draw a distinction between the two, probably "passion" is somewhat less wide than "desire," and the former represents the evil emotion as an affection which the mind suffers, while the

latter represents it as a longing which it actively puts forth. The "lusts of the flesh" are in the one aspect kindled by outward temptations which come with terrible force and carry men captive, acting almost irresistibly on the animal nature. In the other aspect they are excited by the voluntary action of the man himself. In the one the evil comes into the heart; in the other the heart goes out to the evil.

Then follows covetousness. The juxtaposition of that vice with the grosser forms of sensuality is profoundly significant. It is closely allied with these. It has the same root, and is but another form of evil desire going out to the "things which are on the earth." The ordinary worldly nature flies for solace either to the pleasures of appetite or to the passion of acquiring. And not only are they closely connected in root, but covetousness often follows lust in the history of a life just as it does in this catalogue. When the former evil spirit loses its hold, the latter often takes its place. How many respectable middle-aged gentlemen are now mainly devoted to making money, whose youth was foul with sensual indulgence? When that palled, this came to titillate the jaded desires with a new form of gratification. Covetousness is "promoted vice"—lust superannuated.

A reason for this warning against covetousness is appended, "inasmuch as (for such is the force of the word rendered 'the which') it is idolatry." If we say of anything, no matter what, "If I have only enough of this, I shall be satisfied, it is my real aim, my sufficient good," that thing is a god to me, and my real worship is paid to it, whatever my nominal religion. The lowest form of idolatry is the giving of supreme trust to a material thing, and making that a god. There is no lower form of fetish-worship than this, which is the real working religion to-day of thousands of Englishmen who go masquerading as Christians.

III. The exhortation is enforced by a solemn note of warning: "For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience." Some authorities omit the words "upon the children of disobedience," which are supposed to have crept in here from the parallel passage, Eph. v. 6. But even the advocates of the omission allow that the clause has "preponderating support," and the sentence is painfully incomplete and abrupt without it. The R. V. has exercised a wise discretion in retaining it.

In the previous chapter the Apostle included "warning" in his statement of the various branches into which his Apostolic activity was divided. His duty seemed to him to embrace the plain stern setting forth of that terrible reality, the wrath of God. Here we have it urged as a reason for shaking off these evil habits.

That thought of wrath as an element in the Divine nature has become very unwelcome to this generation. The great revelation of God in Jesus Christ has taught the world His love, as it never knew it before, and knows it now by no other means. So profoundly has that truth that God is love penetrated the consciousness of the European world, that many people will not hear of the wrath of God because they think it inconsistent with His love—and sometimes reject the very gospel to which they owe their lofty conceptions of the Divine heart, because it speaks solemn words about His anger and its issues.

But surely these two thoughts of God's love and God's wrath are not inconsistent, for His wrath is His love, pained, wounded, thrown back upon itself, rejected and compelled to assume the form of aversion and to do its "strange work"—that which is not its natural operation—of punishment. When we ascribe wrath to God, we must take care of lowering the conception of it to the level of human wrath, which is shaken with passion and often tinged with malice, whereas in that affection of the Divine

nature which corresponds to anger in us, there is neither passion nor wish to harm. Nor does it exclude the co-existence of love, as Paul witnesses in his Epistle to the Ephesians, in one verse declaring that "we were the children of wrath," and in the next that God "loved us with a great love even when we were dead in sins."

God would not be a holy God if it were all the same to Him whether a man were good or bad. As a matter of fact, the modern revulsion against the representation of the wrath of God is usually accompanied with weakened conceptions of His holiness, and of His moral government of the world. Instead of exalting, it degrades His love, to free it from the admixture of wrath, which is like alloy with gold, giving firmness to what were else too soft for use. Such a God is not love, but impotent good nature. If there be no wrath, there is no love; if there were no love, there would be no wrath. It is more blessed and hopeful for sinful men to believe in a God who is angry with the wicked, whom yet he loves, every day, and who cannot look upon sin, than in one who does not love righteousness enough to hate iniquity, and from whose too indulgent hand the rod has dropped to the spoiling of His children. "With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward." The mists of our sins intercept the gracious beams and turn the blessed sun into a ball of fire.

The wrath "*cometh*." That majestic present tense may express either the continuous present incidence of the wrath as exemplified in the moral government of the world, in which, notwithstanding anomalies, such sins as have been enumerated drag after themselves their own punishment and are "avenged in kind," or it may be the present tense expressive of prophetic certainty, which is so sure of what shall come, that it speaks of it as already on its road. It is eminently true of those sins of lust and passion, that the men who do them reap as they have sown. How

many young men come up into our great cities, innocent and strong, with a mother's kiss upon their lips, and a father's blessing hovering over their heads! They fall among bad companions in college or warehouse, and after a little while they disappear. Broken in health, tainted in body and soul, they crawl home to break their mother's hearts—and to die. "His bones are full of the sins of his youth, which shall lie down with him in the dust." Whether in such extreme forms or no, that wrath comes even now, in plain and bitter consequences on men, and still more on women who sin in such ways.

And the present retribution may well be taken as the herald and prophet of a still more solemn manifestation of the Divine displeasure, which is already as it were on the road, has set out from the throne of God, and will certainly arrive here one day. These consequences of sin already realised serve to show the set and drift of things, and to suggest what will happen when retribution and the harvest of our present life of sowing come. The first fiery drops that fell on Lot's path as he fled from Sodom were not more surely precursors of an overwhelming rain, nor bade him flee for his life more urgently, than the present punishment of sin proclaims its sorer future punishment, and exhorts us all to come out of the storm into the refuge, even Jesus, who is ever even now "delivering us from the wrath which is" ever even now "coming" on the sons of disobedience.

IV. A further motive enforcing the main precept of self-slaying is the remembrance of a sinful past, which remembrance is at once penitent and grateful. "In the which ye also walked aforetime, when ye lived in them."

What is the difference between "walking" and "living" in these things? The two phrases seem synonymous, and might often be used indifferently; but here there is evidently a well marked diversity of meaning. The former is an

expression frequent in the Pauline Epistles as well as in John's; as for instance, "to walk in love" or "in truth." That in which men walk is conceived of as an atmosphere encompassing them; or, without a metaphor, to walk in anything is to have the active life or conduct guided or occupied by it. These Colossian Christians, then, had in the past trodden that evil path, or their active life had been spent in that poisonous atmosphere—which is equivalent to saying that they had committed these sins. At what time? "When you lived in them." That does not mean merely "when your natural life was passed among them." That would be a trivial thing to say, and it would imply that their outward life now was not so passed, which would not be true. In that sense they still lived in the poisonous atmosphere. In such an age of unnameable moral corruption no man could live out of the foul stench which filled his nostrils whenever he walked abroad or opened his window. But the Apostle has just said that they were now "living in Christ," and their lives "hid with Him in God." So this phrase describes the condition which is the opposite of their present, and may be paraphrased, "When the roots of your life, tastes, affections, thoughts, desires were immersed, as in some feculent bog, in these and kindred evils." And the meaning of the whole is substantially—Your active life was occupied and guided by these sins in that past time when your inward being was knit to and nourished by them. Or to put it plainly, conduct followed and was shaped by inclinations and desires.

This retrospect enforces the main exhortation. It is meant to awaken penitence, and the thought that time enough has been wasted and incense enough offered on these foul altars. It is also meant to kindle thankfulness for the strong, loving hand which has drawn them from that pit of filth, and by both emotions to stimulate the resolute casting aside of that evil in which they once, like

others, wallowed. Their joy on the one hand and their contrition on the other should lead them to discern the inconsistency of professing to be Christians and yet keeping terms with these old sins. They could not have the roots of half their lives above and of the other half down here. The gulf between the present and past of a regenerate man is too wide and deep to be bridged by flimsy compromises. "A man who is perverse in his two ways," that is, in double ways, "shall fall in one of them," as the Book of Proverbs has it. The attempt to combine incompatibles is sure to fail. It is impossible to walk firmly if one foot be down in the gutter and the other up on the curb-stone. We have to settle which level we shall choose, and then to plant both feet there.

V. We have, as conclusion, a still wider exhortation to an entire stripping off of the sins of the old state.

The whole force of the contrast and contrariety between the Colossian Christians' past and present lies in that emphatic "now." They as well as other heathen had been walking, because they had been living, in these muddy ways. But now—that their life was hid with Christ in God; now—that they had been made partakers of His death and resurrection, and of all the new loves and affinities which therein became theirs; now—they must take heed that they bring not that dead and foul past into this bright and pure present, nor prolong winter and its frosts into the summer of the soul.

"Ye also." There is another "ye also" in the previous verse—"ye also walked," that is, you in company with other Gentiles followed a certain course of life. Here, by contrast, the expression means "you, in common with other Christians." A motive enforcing the subsequent exhortation is in it hinted rather than fully spoken. The Christians at Colossæ had belonged to a community which they have now left in order to join another. Let them behave as their

company behaves. Let them keep step with their new comrades. Let them strip themselves, as their new associates do, of the uniform which they wore in that other regiment.

The metaphor of putting clothing on or off is very frequent in this Epistle. The precept here is substantially equivalent to the previous command to "slay," with the difference that the conception of vices as the garments of the soul is somewhat less vehement than that which regards them as members of the very self. "All these" are to be put off. That phrase points back to the things previously spoken of. It includes the whole of the unnamed members of the class, of which a few have been already named, and a handful more are about to be plucked like poison flowers, and suggests that there are many more as baleful growing by the side of this devil's bouquet which is next presented.

As to this second catalogue of vices, they may be summarised as, on the whole, being various forms of wicked hatred, in contrast with the former list, which consisted of various forms of wicked love. They have less to do with bodily appetites. But perhaps it is not without profound meaning that the fierce rush of unhallowed passion over the soul is put first, and the contrary flow of chill malignity comes second; for in the spiritual world, as in the physical, a storm blowing from one quarter is usually followed by violent gales from the opposite. Lust ever passes into cruelty, and dwells "hard by hate." A licentious epoch or man is generally a cruel epoch or man. Nero made torches of the Christians. Malice is evil desire iced.

This second list goes in the opposite direction to the former. That began with actions and went up the stream to desires; this begins with the sources, which are emotions, and comes down stream to their manifestations in action.

First we have anger. There is a just and righteous anger, which is part of the new man, and essential to his

completeness, even as it is part of the image after which he is created. But here of course the anger which is to be put off is the inverted reflection of the earthly and passionate lust after the flesh; it is then of an earthly, passionate and selfish kind. "Wrath" differs from "anger" in so far as it may be called anger boiling over. If anger springs in temper, keep the lid on, do not let it get the length of wrath, nor effervesce into the brief madness of passion. But on the other hand, do not think that you have done enough when you have suppressed the wrath which is the expression of your anger, nor be content with saying, "Well, at all events I did not show it," but take the cure a step further back, and strip off anger as well as wrath, the emotion as well as the manifestation.

Christian people do not sufficiently bring the greatest forces of their religion and of God's Spirit to bear upon the homely task of curing small hastinesses of temper, and sometimes seem to think it a sufficient excuse to say, "I have naturally a hot disposition." But Christianity was sent to subdue and change natural dispositions. An angry man cannot have communion with God, any more than the sky can be reflected in the storm-swept tide; and a man in communion with God cannot be angry with a passionate and evil anger any more than a dove can croak like a raven or strike like a hawk. Such anger disturbs our insight into everything; eyes suffused with it cannot see; and it weakens all good in the soul, and degrades it before its own conscience.

"Malice" designates another step in the process. The anger boils over in wrath, and then cools down into malignity—the disposition which means mischief, and plans or rejoices in, evil falling on the hated head. That malice, as cold, as clear, as colourless as sulphuric acid, and burning like it, is worse than the boiling rage already spoken of. There are many degrees of this cold drawn, double distilled

rejoicing in evil, and the beginnings of it in a certain faint satisfaction in the misfortunes of those whom we dislike is by no means unusual.

An advance is now made in the direction of outward manifestation. It is significant that while the expressions of wicked love were deeds, those of wicked hate are words. The "blasphemy" of the Authorised Version is better taken, with the Revised, as "railing." The word means "speech that injures," and such speech may be directed either against God, which is blasphemy in the usual sense of the word, or against man. The hate blossoms into hurtful speech. The heated metal of anger is forged into poisoned arrows of the tongue. Then follows "shameful speaking out of your mouth," which is probably to be understood not so much of obscenities, which would more properly belong to the former catalogue, as of foul-mouthed abuse of the hated persons, that copiousness of vituperation and those volcanic explosions of mud, which are so natural to the angry Eastern.

Finally, we have a dehortation from lying, especially to those within the circle of the Church, as if that sin too were the child of hatred and anger. It comes from a deficiency of love, or a predominance of selfishness, which is the same thing. A lie ignores my brother's claims on me, and my union with him. "Ye are members one of another," is the great obligation to love which is denied and sinned against by hatred in all its forms and manifestations, and not least by giving my brother the poisoned bread of lies instead of the heavenly manna of pure truth, so far as it has been given to me.

On the whole, this catalogue brings out the importance to be attached to sins of speech, which are ranked here as in parallel lines with the grossest forms of animal passion. Men's words ought to be fountains of consolation and sources of illumination, encouragement, revelations of

love and pity. And what are they? What floods of idle words, foul words, words that wound like knives and sting and bite like serpents, deluge the world! If all the talk that has its sources in these evils rebuked here, were to be suddenly made inaudible, what a dead silence would fall on many brilliant circles, and how many us would stand making mouths but saying nothing!

All the practical exhortations of this section concern common homely duties which everybody knows to be such. It may be asked—does Christianity then only lay down such plain precepts? What need was there of all that prelude of mysterious doctrines, if we are only to be landed at last in such elementary and obvious moralities? No doubt they are elementary and obvious, but the main matter is—how to get them kept. And in respect to that, Christianity does two things which nothing else does. It breaks the entail of evil habits by the great gift of pardon for the past, and by the greater gift of a new spirit and life principle within, which is foreign to all evil, being the effluence of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

Therefore the gospel of Jesus Christ makes it possible that men should slay themselves, and put on the new life, which will expel the old as the new shoots on some trees push the last year's lingering leaves, brown and sere, from their places. All moral teachers from the beginning have agreed, on the whole, in their reading of the commandments which are printed on conscience in the largest capitals. Everybody who is not blind can read them. But reading is easy, keeping is hard. How to fulfil has been wanting. It is given us in the gospel, which is not merely a republication of old precepts, but the communication of new power. If we yield ourselves to Christ He will nerve our arms to wield the knife that will slay our dearest tastes, though beloved as Isaac to Abraham. If a man knows and feels that Christ has died for him, and that he lives in and by Christ,

then, and not else, will he be able to crucify self. If he knows and feels that by His pardoning mercy and atoning death, Christ has taken off his foul raiment and clothed him in clean garments, then, and not else, will he be able, by daily effort after repression of self and appropriation of Christ, to put off the old man and to put on the new, which is daily being renewed into closer resemblance to the image of Him who created him.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

MANY of the smaller changes in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, which may in themselves seem trifling, have been introduced, as the Revisers tell us in their Preface, for the sake of uniformity, to render such parallel passages as are identical in Hebrew, by the same English words, so that an English reader may know at once by comparison that a difference in the translation corresponds to a difference in the original. The translators of 1611, as is well known, were careless of uniformity in rendering; and the fact that the Books of Samuel and the Kings fell to the share of the First Company, which met at Westminster, while the Books of the Chronicles were undertaken by the Second Company, which met at Cambridge, affords a further explanation of the diversities of rendering in many passages of these books which are word for word the same in the original.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE KINGS.

i. 18, 20. In the ordinary printed Hebrew text, verse 18 *b* begins **וְעַתָּה אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ**, *and now my lord the king*; and verse 20, **וְאַתָּה אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ**, *and thou my lord the king*

It is clear that similar expressions have been interchanged by a clerical error, and that in *v. 18 b* we should read *and thou*, and in *v. 20*, *and now*. The emphatic pronoun is in its place in *v. 18*; and *now* in *v. 20* marks the conclusion which Bathsheba proceeds to draw from the facts she has stated. The first change is adopted in the text, because it has the support of all the Versions, many Hebrew MSS., and some editions; the second is only given in the margin, because the external evidence for it is less conclusive, though it is found in several MSS., and supported by the Targ. and Vulg.

39. *Took the horn of oil out of the Tent*. The definite article indicates that the specially prepared "holy anointing oil" is meant; and "the Tent" (הַתֵּנָה) was probably the tent which David had set up in Zion for the Ark, and not the Tabernacle, which was at Gibeon. See 2 Sam. vi. 17; 2 Chron. i. 3-5.

ii. 19. *A throne . . . for the king's mother*. The same word, כִּסֵּא, is applied to the king's seat and to that prepared for the queen mother, indicating the dignity attaching to the person of the mother of the reigning monarch. Cf. *e.g.* chap. xv. 13.

iv. 5. *Priest for principal officer*. See note on 2 Sam. viii. 18.

Levy for tribute. See note on 2 Sam. xx. 24; and cf. chap. v. 13.

12. *Jokmeam for Jokneam*, which appears to be a mere misprint in A.V. Cf. 1 Chron. vi. 68. It appears to have been situated in the Jordan valley, on the eastern side of the territory of Ephraim, and must not be confounded with *Jokneam* in Zebulun, near the Kishon, just below the eastern termination of Mt. Carmel (Josh. xii. 22; xix. 11; xxi. 34).

16. *Bealoth*. The name *Aloth* is not found elsewhere, and the R.V. is probably right in following the LXX., Syr.,

and Vulg., and treating כ as part of the name, and not as the preposition. It cannot however be the *Bealoth* of Josh. xv. 24.

iv. 19. *And he was the only officer*, etc. This is perhaps the best sense which can be given to the text. Geber was in charge of such an extensive district that the author of the book thought it worth while to note the fact that he was the only officer there. But there was only one governor in each province; and, as the margin, *and one officer*, indicates, the rendering is a paraphrase rather than a translation. Possibly the reading of the LXX. *and one officer in the land of Judah*, may be right; i.e. in addition to the twelve provincial governors, there was a special officer in charge of the home district.

24. *On this side the River*. Strictly עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר means *beyond the River* (marg.), and denotes the country west of the Euphrates regarded from the Babylonian point of view. The phrase then is clear evidence that the compiler of the Book of Kings lived in the Babylonian period, and possibly indicates that he was writing in Babylonia; but on this latter point it is not conclusive, for, as the usage of Ezra and Nehemiah shows, the term so far acquired a technical geographical sense that it could be used by writers in Palestine. Cf. Ezra iv. 10; v. 3, etc. (Aram.); viii. 36; Neh. iii. 7.

v. 18. *Gebalites for stonesquarers*. הַגִּבְלִים is a proper name, denoting the inhabitants of Gebal, a city on the coast of Phœnicia, known to the Greeks as Byblus. The A.V. appears to be due to the influence of the Targ. and Syr., which render אֲרַנְבָּלִיָּא, *masons*, and Kimchi, who explains the word from גְּבִיל, *a boundary*, to mean the hewers who shaped and squared the stones.

vi. ff. Many changes will be observed in the account of the Temple. The architectural terminology is, as might be expected, obscure and difficult of interpretation, and the

marginal alternatives express the differences of critical opinion.

4. *Windows of fixed lattice-work*, lit. *with closed cross-beams*, resembling perhaps our *louvre-boardings*, and different from the moveable lattices which closed the windows of an ordinary house. This is the interpretation adopted (with some variations in detail) by most modern commentators. The marginal alternative, *windows broad within, and narrow without*, i.e. deeply splayed, is the explanation given by the Targ., Vulg. (*fenestras obliquas*), and most Jewish writers, following the Targ.

8. The reading of LXX. and Targ. given in the margin, הַתִּיכְנָה for הַתְּחַתָּנָה, yields a clear and natural meaning, which the Massoretic text cannot be said to do; and if, as happens to be the case in the Bible Society's edition of the text, one word stood exactly under the other in some MS. from which the text has descended, the mistake is easily explained as an error of sight on the part of a transcriber.

vii. 2. *For he built* (instead of *he built also*) makes it clear that *his own house* in v. 1 denotes the entire royal palace, of which the principal parts are subsequently described in detail. *He built also* in the A.V. involves the much less probable supposition that the buildings described in vv. 2 ff. were distinct from the palace. It is a recognised Hebrew idiom to state a fact generally, and to append by means of ו conversive with the imperfect a number of explanatory details. See Prof. Driver's *Tenses*, § 75.

18. *Pillars*, which is found in some Hebrew MSS., appears to be a necessary correction. The words, as they stand in the Heb. text, can only be translated *upon the top of the pomegranates*, Vulg. *super summitatem malogranatorum*.

24. *For ten cubits*. It is clear that in the previous verse עֶשֶׂר בָּאַמָּה means *ten by the cubit*, i.e. *ten cubits in measure*; and the Revisers have thought right to retain a similar

rendering here. Cf. the Vulg. *et sculptura subter labium circuibat illud decem cubitis ambiens mare*; and Coverdale, *aboute the same laver that was ten cubites wyde there wente knoppes*. But the meaning is obscure; and most commentators adopt the marginal rendering, *ten in a cubit*, the only objection to which is that the words are used in a different sense in the previous verse.

viii. 8. *And the staves were so long*. So the LXX. ὑπερείχον; Vulg. *cumque eminent rectes*; Luther, and Coverdale. וַיֵּאָרְכּוּ is (virtually) intransitive, and the meaning appears to be simply that the staves naturally projected beyond the wings of the overshadowing cherubim. The suggestion that “the withdrawal of the staves was intended as a sign that the ark had reached the place of its rest, and was not to be borne about any more,” rests therefore on an improbable rendering.

31. *And he come and swear*. The rendering of A.V. is not only ungrammatical, but obscures the reference to the custom of an accused person purging himself by a solemn oath before God. Cf. Exod. xxii. 7–11.

65. *The feast, namely, of Tabernacles, v. 2.*

The brook of Egypt, mentioned as the southern border of Israel in Num. xxxiv. 5; Josh. xv. 4; and identified with the *Wady el Arish*. The A.V. *river* is misleading.

ix. 8. The rendering of יְהִיבִית הָיָה יְהִיָּה עֲלֶיךָ concessively, *though this house be so high*, is precarious; and the natural rendering of the clause is that given in the margin. But this involves understanding *high* in the sense of “conspicuous as an example of punishment,” Vulg. *crit in exemplum*, a meaning of עֲלֶיךָ for which no parallel can be quoted. But 2 Chron. vii. 21 reads אֲשֶׁר הָיָה עֲלֶיךָ, *which is so high*, for יְהִיָּה ע. The Targum renders here “this house which was high shall be destroyed”; and the Syriac “this house shall be destroyed.” Thenius and others accordingly conjecture that the original reading here was יְהִיבִית הָיָה

אֶשֶׁר הָיָה עָלָיו יְהִיָּה לְעֵין, *this house which was so high shall become heaps*. Cf. Mic. iii. 12. Or possibly the original reading was, as Bertheau thinks, simply יְהִיָּה לְעֵין, *shall become heaps*, omitting *which was high*.

13. The name *Cabul* evidently expressed Hiram's disapproval; but its meaning is quite uncertain, and the A.V. marginal notes are accordingly dropped. *Displeasing* is a mere conjecture of Josephus, who says the word bore this sense in Phœnician. *Dirty* comes from Hebrew commentators, whose derivations are too fanciful to be worth mention. The most plausible explanation is that of Ewald, that the name was meant to be connected with כ and בל = *as good as nothing*.

18. *Tamar*. So the C'thib. This may be another form of the name *Tadmor*; but the mention of this city in connexion with the southern cities of Gezer, Beth-horon and Baalath, together with the description of its situation as *in the wilderness in the land*, i.e. the wilderness of Judæa, points to some place in the south of Palestine; and a Tamar in the south of Palestine is mentioned in Ezek. xlvii. 19; xlviii. 28. On the other hand the K'ri *Tadmor*, i.e. Palmyra, is supported by 2 Chron. viii. 4, all the Versions, and Josephus. If this reading is adopted (or if *Tamar* = *Tadmor*) בְּאַרְץ, *in the land*, must be omitted, as in Chron., or supplemented by the conjectural addition of *Aram* or *Hamath*, for בְּמִדְבָּר בְּאַרְץ cannot possibly mean *in the land of the wilderness*.

x. 5. All the ancient versions, Luther, Coverdale, and the Genevan, have the marginal rendering, *his burnt offering which he offered in the house of the Lord*. And this is unquestionably the obvious meaning of the words. עֹלָה it is true occurs once in the sense of *step*, in Ezek. xl. 26, but its regular meaning is *burnt offering*, and it is more natural that the magnificence of Solomon's offerings, which has already been referred to in chap. viii. 63, should be in-

stanced as exciting the queen's astonishment, than a structure of which no mention has been made, though it is thought to be alluded to in 2 Kings xvi. 18; 1 Chron. xxvi. 16. But in 2 Chron. ix. 4, we read עֲלִיתִי, which, it is said, must mean *ascent*. Elsewhere, however, it always means *upper chamber*; all the ancient versions have *burnt offerings*; and it is probable that the word is a corruption, by a simple transposition of letters, for עֲלִיתִי, *burnt offerings*.

15. *The mingled people*. So הָעָרָב is rendered in the A.V. of Jer. xxv. 20, 24; Ezek. xxx. 5. In Jer. xxv. 24, "the kings of the mingled people" are coupled with "the kings of Arabia," and defined as those "that dwell in the desert." Some part of Arabia is probably meant, perhaps the border district in which Israelites and Arabs were mingled together. 2 Chron. ix. 14 reads עָרָב, *Arabia*.

28. *In droves for linen yarn*. An obscure passage. The explanation of the A.V. is that of some Jewish commentators, who connect כִּקְוָה with קו, *a cord*. But elsewhere it means *a gathering, collection*. The LXX. ἐκ Θεκουέ and Vulg. *de Coa*, find in the word the name of a place.

xii. 31. *Priests from among all the people*. Cf. xiii. 33; 2 Kings xvii. 32. כִּקְצוֹת הָעָם, lit. *from the extremities of the the people*, does not mean *from the lowest of the people*; Jeroboam had no desire to degrade the priesthood; but *from the whole people*, not confining himself to the tribe of Levi. For כִּקְצוֹת cf. Jud. xviii. 2, R.V. The rendering of A.V. descends from Coverdale's *ev̄ of the smallest of the people*, and he probably took it from Luther's *von der geringsten im Volk*.

33. *Of his own heart*, כִּלְבִּי, K'ri, and all the versions. Marg. *apart*, מִלְּבַד, C'thib.

xiii. 12. *Now his sons had seen*. A passage of considerable grammatical importance. At first sight it seems conclusively to prove that ׀ with the imperfect may express the pluperfect: but all the important versions (LXX., Vulg.,

Targ. [in Walton's Polyglot, but ed. De Lagarde וַיִּרְאוּ], Syr.), represent the Hiphil וַיִּרְאוּ; and *his sons shewed him*, as in the margin. The passage must not then be quoted as an instance of a usage which cannot be substantiated by other certain examples, and text and margin should change places. The Massoretic punctuation of the verb as Qal is perhaps due to the omission of the suffix. See Prof. Driver's *Tenses*, § 76 *Obs.*, where the question is fully discussed.

xix. 3. Marg. *And he was afraid*: i.e. וַיִּירָא (as 1 Sam. xviii. 12) for וַיִּרְא, altering the points. So some MSS., LXX., Vulg., Syr., suitably to the context.

18. *Yet will I leave*. So וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי must be translated, with the ancient versions. Coverdale and the Genevan give the future correctly. The A.V. may have been misled by *κατέλιπον* in Rom. xi. 4. The meaning is that in the midst of all the vengeance which is to fall on Israel for its idolatries, the faithful "remnant" (שְׁאֵרִית, שְׂאָר) will be preserved.

xx. 38, 41. *Headband*. The A.V. follows Vulg. and Syr. in taking אָפֶר to be identical with אָפֶר *ashes*. The LXX. (τελαμών) and Targ. כִּיעֶפְרָא, *velum*, explain the word rightly.

xxi. 23. The text has בְּחֵל, and so the LXX.; but Targ., Syr., Vulg., read, as noted in the margin, בְּחֵלֶק, as in 2 Kings ix. 10, 36.

xxii. 38. *Now the harlots washed themselves there*: an additional element of ignominy in Ahab's fate. So the LXX. rightly. נִזֹּת means nothing but *harlots* in Hebrew: and the rendering of the A.V., which connects the word with the Aramaic זָן *armour*, though it has the support of the Targ. and Syr., can hardly be defended. Moreover, if the word were the object of the verb, it would naturally be preceded by אֵת to avoid ambiguity; and רָחַץ is generally (though not quite exclusively) used of *washing the person* or *bathing*.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—Whatever satisfaction there may be in setting a book of Scripture permanently higher in the regard of the Church, in disclosing its hidden magnificence, in making its inspiration palpable, and in bringing its ores to the surface for the common good, has been fairly earned by Prof. Milligan.¹ It were indeed too much to say that he has added a book to the canon, turning what has hitherto been a stumbling-block into a corner-stone; for, although scientific interpretation on entering the charmed territory of the Apocalypse has found itself beridden and strangled by the Neronic Old Man of the Sea, and although interpretation not scientific has been able to find in one of the most majestic of literary productions, nothing better than an inspired Zadkiel wherewith to titillate and cajole prying minds, simple desire for edification has at all times seen in it the encouraging spectacle of the various conflicts and trials and ultimate triumph of the Church of Christ. But it is the merit of Prof. Milligan to have demonstrated that the significance of the book which has thus approved itself to the Christian consciousness is that which alone is scientifically tenable. He has conclusively shown that the systems of interpretation known as “the continuously historical,” “the Futurist,” and “the Praterist,” are alike incompetent. The book is no prediction of special events, whether in the near or the distant future; it gives no knowledge of the future which had not already been given by Christ Himself. Its subject no doubt is the history of the Church of Christ until His second coming, but that history is exhibited not in its leading epochs or events, but in its governing principles. The conflict, the preservation, and the triumph of the Church are represented in suitable and impressive symbols. Guided by his intimate knowledge of the significance of Christ’s career on earth, and by his belief in the identity of Christ and His people, the seer reads the fortunes of the Church mirrored in the life of her Lord, and depicts these fortunes with colours drawn from the Old Testament Scriptures. The Book of Revelation is thus the complement of the Fourth

¹ *The Revelation of St. John.* By William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

Gospel; and by the convincing manner in which he has exhibited the inter-relation of these writings, Prof. Milligan has furnished fresh and telling evidence in favour of their common authorship. In order perfectly to test the principles of interpretation so ably advocated in this volume, one would need to apply them in detail to every verse of the Apocalypse. And the mind requires a little time to adjust itself to the new ideas and to recover from the shock of relinquishing at a blow so many of its pet interpretations, of learning that the Scarlet Woman, the False Prophet, the Beast, are other than they have seemed. It is difficult also at once to reverse all modern criticism and accept 96 A.D. as the probable date of this book, or to accept any explanation that has yet been offered of its grammatical anomalies. But all that is urged by Prof. Milligan is presented with such sobriety of mind and reasonableness, is backed by arguments so convincing and by scholarship so thorough, and brings to the mind so much of the sudden enlightenment and conviction which wait upon truth, that there can be no question his book deserves, and will receive, respectful consideration, and will permanently influence the Church's attitude towards the Apocalypse.

“To shift knowledge into more convenient positions is to render no unimportant service to mankind”—a fact which the critic does well to bear in mind. Nothing is more idle than to wish a man's function were different from that which has been unalienably and unalterably assigned to him by nature and circumstances. Nothing is more idle than to blame a man because, being six feet high, he is not six feet two. Because Dr. Farrar has made Scriptural subjects as popular as the novel of the week, and has thus done excellent service in his own generation, are we to be exasperated if he do not excel himself and write theological classics and works which are destined to live with the language? He has not all the gifts; especially he has not the patience to compress and to refine; he is too ready, as he himself quotes from Jerome, *dictare quodcumque in buccam venerit*; but he has untiring and well-directed industry, competent scholarship, ready apprehension, and an eloquent, if somewhat turgid style. Probably he himself feels more than any one the damage his work sustains from the rapidity of its production: *condo et compono quæ mox depromere possim*, might most likely be found affixed as a motto to his note books, if he has time even to pass things through a note-book.

And the reader is sensible that he has been regaled at a feast of scraps, from which he rises with hunger only partially assuaged; bits of many things, tasty and stimulating, have been presented to him, but nothing perfectly satisfying remains with us. Nothing has been finally dealt with by the hand of a master. In this *History of Interpretation*,¹ an astonishing amount of material is gathered together; a thousand things are here brought under the eye, and "shifted into a more convenient position," for which we should previously have been obliged to ransack several less accessible books; and readers of this magazine are aware that for some years Dr. Farrar has been familiar with the branch of investigation whose fruit he offers in these Lectures. And yet the History of Interpretation remains to be written. It may be found in this volume by inference, by dissecting out irrelevancies, by tracing for ourselves hidden connexions; and it may be cordially owned that this is the best history accessible to the English reader, and that as a popular presentation of the subject it is admirable; yet for the student it leaves much to be desired. A history should not only give some account of the events and persons of the past, but should enable the student to see clearly how the present springs from the past. In exhibiting the connexion of one age with another, and of the general thought of each age to the special subject of interpretation of Scripture, Dr. Farrar's history is not sufficiently thought out. Philosophies are described, but their bearing on exegesis is only dimly indicated. Too much room is given to matter which can be found in any Church history, and too little room or none at all is afforded to matters directly affecting interpretation. We find no account given of the growth of the knowledge of Greek during the last three hundred years; no attempt to appraise with definiteness the distinctive contributions of English and German scholars to the exegesis of Scripture; no notice of the manner in which the aids to hermenutics have recently been accumulated; no history of the remarkable growth of that greatest of all hermeneutical instruments, common sense; no survey of our present position, our attainments, our desiderata. But with all deductions, this is a book for which the student should be thankful, and if he cannot make good use of it, blame himself and not Dr. Farrar.

¹ *History of Interpretation* (*Bampton Lectures for 1885*), by Frederic W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., etc. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

Already favourably known as the author of an annotated edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Mr. Rendall now publishes two essays¹ which are in reality an introduction and an appendix to his former book. The object of the first of these essays is to investigate the authorship of the Epistle, to differentiate its theology from the theology of St. Paul, and to identify it with that of the Apostles of the Circumcision. Mr. Rendall distinctly advances the discussion of these points. He gives the *coup de grace* to the claim of Apollos, and in doing so makes two or three most pertinent though commonly neglected observations on the Alexandrian school of thought. The claim of Paul is also finally disposed of; for, though the difference between his theology and that of the Epistle is certainly exaggerated by Mr. Rendall, yet after every required deduction enough of difference remains to preclude the possibility of identifying the writer of the Epistle with St. Paul. This essay of ninety pages contains much which must be considered by every serious student of the New Testament, and it is written in strong and graceful English. The second essay, on the Sacrificial Language of the New Testament, is the kind of paper which every one will read twice and will seek to master. So far as regards the exhibition of the fulfilment in Christ of the sacrificial types of the Old Testament, and the explanation of the language involved, nothing need be better. Scholarship and sympathetic and independent thought have been lavishly spent on this study. But though Mr. Rendall has thoroughly done his work, he has but brought us to an edge from which we gaze into unfathomable depths. Enquiry into the Atonement is like the search for the North Pole: approach it from what direction we may, there are unmistakable indications that a finality exists in that direction; but to make our way to it and take an actual survey all round at once is still beyond us. Certain variations of the compass Mr. Rendall has admirably corrected, and one open waterway he has more clearly ascertained; and this is much.

EXEGESIS.—“Most commentaries are quite unadapted for practical work with boys. Their fault is this. The editors do not confine themselves chiefly to explanation of the text, which is the first and strictly the only duty of a commentator, but encumber

¹ *Theology of the Hebrew Christians*, by Frederic Rendall, A.M., Assistant Master of Harrow School. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886).

their notes with doctrinal discussions and moral reflections." Under this impression, Mr. Page of Charterhouse has set himself the task of furnishing schools with an edition of the *Acts of the Apostles* suitable for the use of boys.¹ His small volume will be found of great value not only to school boys, but to much more advanced students. It is not a hurried compilation but an original work; the work of a scholar who knows the value of other men's labours but whose own familiarity both with classical and biblical study enables him always to form his own judgment and frequently to adduce fresh material. Greater praise cannot be given than to say it is quite on a level with his edition of Horace's Odes; and this praise is deserved. We may borrow from his former work and apply to himself his own criticism of Nauck: "The notes are always very brief, very much to the point, and very well worth consideration." More than this, there occur once or twice suggestions of the very highest importance. Books such as this and the volumes of the Cambridge Greek Testament render the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles as available as the classics for study in the higher forms of schools.

To the last-named series a volume on the Epistles of St. John has been added by Dr. Plummer.² The ten pages of text are almost lost in nearly 300 pages of introduction and notes. This is scarcely suited for school purposes; but no one who wishes to make a thorough study of the Epistles of St. John will find more for his purpose in any single commentary. The notes are careful, instructive, and in sympathy with the spirit of the Apostle. The introduction is written in an interesting style; but on one or two points further consideration might perhaps diminish the confidence of assertion. Possibly by a misprint a wrong date is assigned to the death of Domitian; and the meaningless sentence on p. xliii. should not have been overlooked.

A book with many a good sermon in it is sure to be popular with preachers; and Dr. Morison has in his commentaries contrived to be at once so thoroughly exact in exegesis and so homiletically suggestive that no one is surprised at his popularity.

¹ *The Acts of the Apostles, being the Greek Text as revised by Drs. Westcott and Hort, with Explanatory Notes*, by Thomas Ethelbert Page, M.A., Assistant Master at Charterhouse. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

² *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The Epistles of St. John*, by Rev. A. Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham. (Cambridge: University Press, 1886.)

His present monograph on the sixth chapter of Romans¹ will rather increase than diminish his reputation. It is intended "to speak directly to the unprofessional intelligence," and it is an admirable specimen of the manner in which a thoroughly instructed and vivacious teacher can lead the lay mind to the most exact scrutiny of the words and thoughts of his text. Dr. Morison's ideas will shortly find echoes in many pulpits. One or two there are which, we hope, will not be echoed, though slight harm will be done if they should be. On p. 38 "alive to God" has scarcely justice done it. On p. 41 there is a slight want of perception in his view of the antithesis. An uninstructed reader would suppose (p. 28) he meant that "autem" is not the exact equivalent of δέ metabatic.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Had Renan contented himself with writing civil history he would have been voted by more voices than one "the most subtle and attractive of living historians." Dr. Cunningham is not a Renan, but had he confined himself to the work for which nature has furnished him with exceptional qualifications he would at least have earned a stainless fame. He is familiar with historical investigation and has produced a history of the Church of Scotland which is on the whole the best. Few men have greater diligence; and he has the faculty of weaving his information into a well-ordered and intelligent narrative. But in attempting a sketch of the Church's growth, there were needed a truer sympathy with her institutions and a finer delicacy of spiritual perception than he possesses. His treatment of the Sacraments abounds in expressions which will make sensitive readers shiver. Why does Dr. Cunningham spoil his best work by yielding to that fatality which carries him into the use of vulgar and offensive phrases? What can be said of the historian of the Christian Church who looks back with longing regret to the too festive agapæ of the Corinthian Christians, and thinks it "a grim belief" that converted the supper into a sacrament; who looks forward eagerly to the time when the church shall become a lecture-hall; who supposes that the catechumen was disappointed to find in Baptism "nothing but a cold bath;"² who seems to

¹ *St. Paul's Teaching on Sanctification. A Practical Exposition of Romans vi.* by James Morison, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.)

² *The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions being the Croall Lectures for 1886.* By John Cunningham, D.D. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

think he has made a hit when he nicknames Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper, "anthropophagism"? Calvin's doctrine was originally very "high," and may not have been the worse for the slight dilution with Zwinglianism it afterwards underwent; but a little more care, or even a reference to a trustworthy history of doctrine, would have saved Dr. Cunningham from the blundering account he gives of it. In comparison with the offences against good taste and good theology which spoil these chapters, such little blemishes as the persistent mis-spelling of Gieseler's name and the occasional mis-spelling of other names, are trivial and of no moment. There was room for a book on the growth of Christian institutions, and until we are provided with the work of a serious, sympathetic, and learned historian, Dr. Cunningham's Lectures will be serviceable. They are full of material and are written in a lively style.

In his *Introduction to Theology*,¹ Principal Cave aims at furnishing the student with a general survey of the various branches of the science and of their mutual relations. The book seems rather cumbrous to be practically serviceable to the beginner. A much more succinct and direct statement would better have served his purposes. There certainly is, however, room for a full and scientific treatment of this subject. Whether theology can claim to be a science; what are the facts with which it deals; and what its instruments of observation, and its methods of verification, experiment, and inference—these are questions which still await such an answer as will set all minds at rest. In Principal Cave's answer there is much that is carefully thought and valid. But many of his readers will desiderate a clearer distinction between facts of literature and facts of life, and a fuller recognition of the latter class of facts as the material of theological science. Can facts which are not demonstrable be the basis of a science? And if only such facts as are demonstrable be admitted, must not theology materially limit its range? There can, however, be no doubt that Mr. Cave has laid students of theology under obligation by the list of books which he recommends under each division of his subject. More than two hundred pages of his volume are occupied with the names and brief characterizations of the books

¹ *An Introduction to Theology: Its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature.* By Alfred Cave, B.A., Principal of Hackney College. (Edinburgh: T. T. Clark, 1886.)

which have either made epochs in the history of the subject they deal with, or present the subject in its maturest forms. His characterizations of these books are for the most part admirably done: they are brief, significant, and just. Occasionally of course he nods. Admirers of Mibuan's learned and massive histories will feel injured on reading the brief label here affixed to them by Mr. Cave, "popular and large minded." The eminently useful and trustworthy collection of facts and laws made by Mr. Brace in his *Gesta Christi*, is ticketed "striking." But more unaccountable are some of the omissions. Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus*, one of the most widely circulated theological manuals ever published, is not mentioned. The most eventful of histories, that of the Church of Scotland, is represented by one tame book, to the exclusion of the model researches of Skene and Grub, and of John Knox's contemporary account of the Reformation, a book racy of the soil in every line. Other omissions are quite as remarkable; and it cannot be want of room which has caused them, for room has been found for some notoriously untrustworthy and feeble books. Still this part of Mr. Cave's work should not be lost, and if carefully revised and purged from the misprints which abound—at least once to the extent of three on a page—would be a real boon to students.

The Religious Tract Society issues a revised edition of Dr. Samuel G. Green's *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament*,¹ which is probably on the whole the best instrument we have for converting a tyro into a fairly equipped scholar. Any one who transfers to his mind what this book contains, will have an adequate knowledge of Greek Testament grammar. To those who have not learned Greek in their boyhood, though not to them only, Dr. Green's Handbook will be a most welcome aid. Two suggestions may perhaps be allowed in view of another edition. The Vocabulary encumbers the book; and if it is to form a part of it, it should be improved. And Dr. Green has perhaps underrated the interest beginners take in the niceties of Greek syntax. The different meaning, *e.g.* of the various participial tenses is susceptible of easy and interesting treatment; and an accurate apprehension of such points removes from the begin-

¹ *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament.* Revised and improved edition. (Religious Tract Society.)

ner's mind the idle notion that some words in a foreign language are used vaguely and at random.

Dr. Taylor's Lectures on the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*¹ are an admirable specimen of the fresh interest which a specialist can lend to a trite subject. There is scarcely more difference between what is seen by the naked eye and by the eye armed with a microscope, than there is between what we can read with our own understanding and with the aid of an expert. The *Didaché* is intensely Jewish, and it was not to be expected that it would yield its full meaning to any interpreter who was not accomplished in Hebrew learning. From the Hebrew sources with which he is so familiar, Dr. Taylor brings an amount of apposite illustration which gives new significance to several passages. The gleanings of this Talmudist are, indeed, more than the vintage of less learned critics. Phrases in the text which up to this time have been of doubtful meaning are now at once removed beyond debate; and as one result of this learned and interesting examination of the *Didaché*, it will probably now be most generally accepted as "a genuine fragment of the earliest tradition of the Church."

It was not to be expected that the criticisms of Bishop Lightfoot's great work, contributed to the *EXPOSITOR* by Professor Harnack, would be allowed to pass unchallenged. In the current number of the *Quarterly Review*, a vigorous effort to turn the edge of these criticisms is made in an article devoted to the Ignatian Epistles. One who ventures to strike up the crossed swords of two such antagonists had himself need to wield a blade of tried temper. And the Quarterly Reviewer who thus with vizzor down enters the lists is certainly not wholly unfit for the enterprise he essays. He has made a careful study of the subject, and nothing can be better than the spirit in which he writes. But though the article is in some respects serviceable, we cannot but think it leaves the discussion very much where it found it. So far as regards the question whether the Epistles are written in view of one heresy or two, the Reviewer does not indeed profess to advance any evidence or argument. And in answer to the much more important question whether in any locality monarchical

¹ *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with Illustrations from the Talmud.* Two Lectures given at the Royal Institution, by C. Taylor, D.D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1886.)

episcopacy existed at the close of the Apostolic age, nothing is advanced which can materially modify Professor Harnack's conclusion. At the same time no one can read this article without perceiving that things are fast ripening for a thorough, perhaps for a final discussion of this long-debated subject.

SERMONS.—The study and exposition of systematic theology is not the best training for sermon-writing. And those who have made Archdeacon Lee's acquaintance through his important work, *On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, may be disappointed with the memorial volume of sermons¹ recently published. Acceptable no doubt these sermons will prove to his friends, who can associate them with the living presence of their author, but they are not likely to attract the attention of readers who have not this advantage. Archdeacon Lee was a man of fascinating and noble character, the beauty of whose life lent weight and interest to all his utterances. But in themselves and in detachment from the living presence, these sermons are bald and colourless. They are formed on the model of Waterland; they are serious, stately, and in accordance with Anglican doctrine, but not stimulating.

Another recent volume² of sermons preached by a dignitary of the Episcopal Church in Ireland is of very different character. The Bishop of Derry has arranged his sermons in four groups, bearing respectively the titles of "The Evidences of Christianity," "Christian Life," "Characters," "The Church in Idea and Fact." Their most prominent characteristic is a frank heartiness, which is exceptional in this branch of literature. Questions of the day are treated with geniality and insight, and nothing is spoken of which is not interesting. The mind with which the reader comes in contact in these sermons is keenly alive and richly stored. The candid observation of human life, the light and sure literary touch, the sparkling illustrations selected from a wide knowledge of literature and of affairs, the correct estimate of various moods of mind, and especially the true and tender Christianity which breathes through the whole, make this an unusually pleasant and profitable volume.

Contrary to his original intention, Dr. Farrar was induced,

¹ *University Sermons*, by William Lee, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin. (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1886.)

² *The Great Question and other Sermons*, by William Alexander, D.D., Hon. D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1885.)

during his tour in America, to deliver a number of sermons and addresses. These are now published¹ in this country as well as in the States, and afford a fresh proof of the fertility and readiness of their author. In addition to his well-known characteristics, they exhibit an abundance and aptness of quotation from American writers, and of reference to American history, which would no doubt propitiate Transatlantic audiences. But quotation can be overdone, and there is a suggestion of the "purple patch" in some of these sermons. The brilliance which is secured by the use of the concrete rather than the abstract is one of the most effective instruments of the public speaker, and where the memory is as capacious and retentive as Dr. Farrar's this brilliance has an inexhaustible source. Pruned and concentrated, his style would in this one respect rival Macaulay's, but Macaulay never brings to the lips the words of the priest's slave in Horace, "Pane egeo jam mellitis potiore placentis." The saving virtue of all Dr. Farrar's sermons is his genuine moral indignation and the eloquence arising from it. The paper on Dante is interesting, but in this, and one or two other of the pieces now published, the question is inevitably suggested, How can one who does not believe in eternal punishment use this language? To evade the odium and yet employ the terrors of a doctrine is a style of inconsistency to which Dr. Farrar would certainly not consciously condescend.

We have received Dr. Thomas' Homilistic Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, entitled *The Genius of the Fourth Gospel* (Dickinson: London, 1885, 2 vols.), which will doubtless be found of use to a certain order of preachers. *The New Moral Creation*, by Rev. John Cooper (Edinburgh: Macniven & Wallace, 1885), a writer whose books will never win the popularity they deserve, owing to the bare severity of his thought and language. *The Biblical Scheme of Nature and Man*, four lectures by Alexander Mackennal, B.A. (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1886), a wise and well-informed attempt to remove uneasiness regarding the trustworthiness of the Bible. *Gospel Difficulties, or the Displaced Section of St. Luke*, by J. J. Halcombe, M.A. (London: Clay & Son, 1886), to which we shall probably return in a future survey. *Christian Baptism, its Moral and Religious Significance*, by Stephen P. Harvard (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co.,

¹ *Sermons and Addresses delivered in America*, by Frederic W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

1882), a pamphlet of eighty-four pages in which, together with some interpretations which are more than doubtful, some light is shed on the real meaning and true place of baptism. The author however has restricted himself too much to one aspect of the rite.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

On the Book of Judith.—More pressing subjects than the Apocrypha have lately engrossed the attention of Biblical students. But a few, it appears, have at least as a *πάρεργον* occupied themselves with “that noble tragedy,” the Book of Judith. The latest of these writers is Bishop Neteler. But an article by the Rev. E. L. Hicks, well known in connexion with Greek inscriptions, deserves to find a record here, as not very many Bible students may have access to the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. The author “arrives at much the same result as Ewald, though by a very different path.” One of the coins which Mr. Clarke brought from Priène in 1870, and now in the British Museum, bears the legend, “King Orophernes the Victorious.” This acquisition led Mr. Hicks to study the life of Orophernes II., king of Cappadocia, who is undoubtedly the king whose features are reproduced on the coin. “The conviction thus became irresistible, that the author of Judith could hardly have learned the alien name Holofernes through any other channel than this, and therefore that the date of the book cannot be earlier, and is probably not much later, than B.C. 150.” He thinks that the story of the sending out of Holofernes was suggested by the expedition of Nicanor under Demetrius I. Soter, who was gloriously defeated by Judas Maccabeus. (Ewald had thought of Demetrius II.)

T. K. CHEYNE.

On Job vi. 25.—

“How far from grievous are straightforward speeches,
But how little is proved by your reproof!”

This is substantially Kleinert's view of the passage (“die vielgequälte Stelle”): he takes *וְיָ* in both lines in the negative sense which it occasionally has elsewhere in Hebrew, and constantly in

Arabic; what, as an exclamation, being equivalent to "how absolutely not, or nothing." Comp. Job. ix. 2; xvi. 6; xxxi. 1; and the characteristic use of כִּי־לֹא "how seldom," xxi. 19. Kleinert remarks that the problem of suffering has found such a pointed and classical expression in the Book of Job, because the conceptions of religious morality in Hebrew (in this respect not very unlike Assyrian), took a thoroughly forensic form. (Comp. Fremantle, *Bampton Lectures*.) It is a mark of later date, he thinks, in the speeches of Elihu, that the phraseology of this part of the book is not forensic. The speaker leaves the sharp lines of a judicial exposition of the case between Job and God, and passes into a purely didactic and hortatory investigation of the question. Kleinert, like Delitzsch, holds the Elihu portion to be a later addition to the Book of Job, but remarks that the instruction and edification to be gained from these speeches is so great that no one would wish them away. See his well-written article, "The specifically Hebrew element in the Book of Job," in the *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, 1886, Heft 2.

T. K. CHEYNE.

On Ps. cxxiii. 2.—Notice the beautiful surprise prepared for us. We should expect "even so our eyes wait upon our Master" (וְעֵינֵינוּ, comp. cxxxv. 5); but the Psalmist remembers that his God is more than a taskmaster, that he is a personal Friend with a personal name—Yahvè.

T. K. CHEYNE.

DANCING AND PENTATEUCH CRITICISM IN CORRELATION.¹

PEOPLE danced in olden times, and they danced in after times ; much dancing was done then, and not a little has been done since ; they danced of old at festivals, and in later days people were not wont to hang down their heads at festivals.

It is the modern Criticism of the Pentateuch to which we oppose these assertions. We do not call in question the deliverance that the middle books of the Pentateuch present the latest form of the Mosaic law, but we deny that this legislation has impoverished for these festivals the exuberant natural joy of former times.

We are not now speaking of the Judaism of the Talmud and of the Ghetti, but of the people of the post-exilian restoration age. We are told these people are not so much a nation as a sect.² But they have heroically wrested their independence in the Maccabæan age from the Seleucidan tyranny, and then this re-acquired independence bled out its life in an incomparably tragic struggle in two insurrections against the Roman domination under the emperors Vespasian and Hadrian. The histories of these two struggles for liberty are, I ween, in reality great national histories.

¹ An address delivered in an Academic evening-circle at Leipzig. Revised with additions, for THE EXPOSITION.

² Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (1883), p. 29: "From the exile there returned not the nation, but a religious sect, those who had devoted themselves body and soul to the reformatory ideas." Smend, in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, ii. 94: "The ancient Israel was a nation and a national state, Judaism is a religious community."

And why are the post-exilian people to be thought a sect? Unity of religion and unity of worship, and a central sanctuary, are surely not things which destroy the essential character of a people. The Arab tribes, and the nationalities which with one accord pray with the face turned towards the Kaba in Mecca, and know no greater bliss than to make a pilgrimage thither at least once in their lives, are not on that account considered to be sects.

But, we are told, the legislation of the post-exilian priestly codex has deprived the cultus of its fresh popularity, since it has regulated the same by statute and restricted it to the Temple of Jerusalem, and since it has given to the sacrifices the preponderant reference to sin and expiation, and has made of the old feasts of nature, whose name *haggim* (הַגִּים), denotes "dances," general ecclesiastical festivals with historic bearings. "Threshing-floor and winepress, corn and must, were the motives of the ancient Israelite religion; pure mirth, noisy jubilation its expression."¹

We maintain that this remained so in later times also. The post-exilian practice divested the festivals of their former heathen character, and elevated them to national festivals of a monotheistic people, without diminishing the festive mirth. The love of dancing remained the same after as before. Some festive scenes from the life of the people, and those taken from the rather sombre than cheerful period of the Herodian vassal sway and the Roman supremacy, may suffice to prove this.

On the north side of the hill on which lies, at a distance of an hour and a quarter northwards from Jerusalem, Anâtâ, the birthplace of the prophet Jeremiah, stands a group of the inhabitants eagerly gazing into the distance. In the pure air of Palestine sound travels more quickly and fully

¹ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 102, 112.

and to a greater distance than with us. They have caught the notes of distant music. After a long time of waiting, a procession descends from a height beyond, and amidst the strains of music crosses the valley. The music ceases while they move up the rising ground to Anátà. Meanwhile the intelligence has spread throughout the whole locality. From the flat roofs of the higher houses people wave kerchiefs as a salutation to those who are approaching. The youth of the place run through the streets on all sides with the joyful cry *chalilayya!* (flutes) *maythayya debikkurayya!* (bringers of the first-fruits).¹ Soon after this the procession has crowned the ridge of the hill, the music resounds again, and from every house of the locality people swarm forth. At the head of the procession walks a splendid ox, his horns overlaid with gold and a wreath of olive branches upon his head. Then come flute-players who peal forth exhilarating airs; then asses with baskets, some plain, some adorned with gold and silver, full of fresh figs and clusters of grapes, and others with baskets full of dried figs and raisins, and others with cages full of young doves and turtles; last of all the representatives of the district of Michmash, who now convey its first fruits to the Temple. The flute is properly the instrument which calls to the dance, as accordingly in the Lord's parable of the children playing in the market-place, the ones in displeasure say to the others, "We have fluted to you and ye have not danced" (Luke vii. 32). The whole population of Anátà seems to have been smitten by the tarantula. When the procession, after staying for some refreshments, striking up afresh, sets itself again in motion and descends into the verdant hollow, old and young march behind, mothers wave their little ones upon their hands as though for a dance, maidens skip in dance—step to the front and form circles, which dissolve again without delaying the procession, choirs

הַלֵּילָה מִתְחִילָה דְּבִכּוּרָה¹

of men sing national melodies, such as "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee." Many follow the procession to the vicinity of Jerusalem, where it halts and sends forward messengers into the city to announce its arrival. In the meantime the firstfruits are ornately arranged, and the finest of the grapes, pomegranates and other fruits are placed around as a garland. Deputies of the Temple present themselves, honourably to receive the newcomers; and when, now amidst strains of music, they enter Jerusalem, the craftsmen who are working on the street in front of their houses pause in their labour, stand up and greet the incoming ones, "Brethren, men of Michmash, welcome!" Then the full baskets, with the doves tied to their sides, are by the bringers of them carried upon their shoulders up the Temple hill, and are met upon their entrance to the court of the Temple with Levitical chant of psalms. The doves are offered as burnt-offerings, the ox as a peace-offering, and of the latter the bringers receive a portion for a festive repast, which could be held anywhere in Jerusalem where they might lodge.¹ Is not all this popular in its character, genial, fair and mirthful, and was it not natural that, after the people possessed its own land, land and people in their totality should render the tribute of gratitude out of the abundance of the blessing bestowed? No limit was thereby set to the self-denying zeal of the individual.

The land was divided into twenty-four districts; and there was thus hardly a trade route in the country those dwelling near which had not an opportunity of witnessing, between Pentecost and Tabernacles, the enchanting spectacle of such Bikkurim-procession. The days of the Feast of Tabernacles, too, showed in manifold ways that the post-exilic festal ritual left the festive joy in the things

¹ Main sources: Mishna, *Bikkurim*, iii. 2, 3, and the Palestinian Gemara thereon.

of nature undisturbed. One could then see, even before the dawn of the first day of the feast, if this was not a sabbath, a joyous throng pouring forth from the Jaffa Gate at Jerusalem. The way leads at first through stony land, and then winds down a long descent into the Wadi Chanina, above which on the right hand lay the villages Moza (מוצה) and Kolonia (קלניא). The verdure of the orchards, refreshed with the first showers of the early rain, is hailed by the people with shouts of joy, as they scatter on either side of the bridge which crosses the brook fringed with tall poplar-osiers,¹ some in order with their own hands to pluck branches for the festive display, others to look on at the men who have been honoured with the commission to fetch from Kolonia the festal leafy adornment of the altar. They seek out right long and goodly branches of these poplar-osiers and cut them off, and then the reunited host returns in procession, with exultant shouts and singing and jesting, to Jerusalem, as far as the Temple hill, where the great branches of poplar-osier are received by the priests and set upright around the sides of the altar, so that they bend over it with their tips. Priestly trumpet-clang resounded during this decoration of the altar with foliage, and they went on that feast day once, on the seventh day seven times, around the altar, with willow branches, or the festive posy² entwined of a palm branch (*lulab*) and branches of myrtles and willows, amidst the usual festive shouts of Hosanna; exclaiming, after the completed encircling, "Beauty becomes thee, O altar! Beauty becomes thee, O altar!"³ One

¹ ערב (ערבה), *populus Euphratica*; different from עפצפה, *salix*, though both belonging to the family of the *salicinae*.

² Composed of the so-called four kinds (ארבעה מינים).

³ Mishna, *Succa*, sec. iv. Maimonides, *Hilchoth Lulab*, vii. 21-23; comp., as regards what was borne in the hands in encompassing the altar, *Succa*, 43 b. The court of the priests (except the space between the altar and the porch) was accessible to the male Israelites. See Mishna, *Kelim*, i. 8, 9.

may regard this post-exilian festive custom as pleasing or otherwise; in no case is it morose and gloomy. Our Luther, translating the 27th verse of Ps. cxviii: "*Schmücket das Fest mit Maien bis an die Hörner des Altars*,"¹ compares those branches of poplar-osier to the birches which we set up as May-poles at Whitsuntide, and around which the May or Whitsun dance is held. For the world of nature has its festivals, and the world of spirit has its festivals, and there is nothing more joyous and sensible than the interpenetration of the two.

To those which are strictly festivals of dance we come only now. One of the most gladsome days of the people was the 15th Ab, a July or August day, the closing day of the woodcutting for the altar of burnt-offering, upon which, even when no offering was being presented, a glimmering fire was to be maintained day and night by a renewal of the layer of wood. As the Græco-Roman spectacular contests are one of the main reasons why the lion has disappeared from Palestine and the region of the Mediterranean in general, so has that altar, which consumed an immense quantity of wood, to bear the main part of the blame, that in a wide circle around Jerusalem there are no forests properly speaking, only jungles of brushwood, devoid of trees, or with only a tree here and there. At the time, however, to which we transport ourselves back, the state of matters was otherwise, notwithstanding the previous desolating wars; then there were still to be found, not far from Hebron, and especially upon the mountains of Ephraim and Benjamin, forests of lofty trees, and the duty of providing the altar thence with wood was an affair of honour for the priestly, Levitical, and patrician families who had tendered their services therefor,

¹ The English version, "*Bind the sacrifice (collectively: the multitude of victims) with cords, even unto the horns of the altar*," corresponds better to the original text.

and among whom the instalments were determined by lot. Nehemiah, in the Biblical book excerpted from his *Memorabilia*, attaches great importance to the now completed organisation for this wood supply, or, as it is called, this wood-offering (קרְבַן הָעֵצִים). The 15th Ab was the closing day of the tree-felling, on which all without distinction of family could take part in the procuring of the wood, the festival of the Xylophoria (ἡ τῶν ξυλοφορίων ἑορτή) as Josephus names it. Old and young, rich and poor, betook them to the precincts of the forest; the fairest adornment was the axe upon the shoulder; and the jubilation with which the wood was conveyed in carriages, or on beasts of burden, especially oxen, or upon stalwart shoulders, within the precincts of the Temple, was no whit inferior to the jubilation of harvest festivities.¹ For a people is, and always will be, a natural quantity and no spiritual one, and therefore it celebrates religious festivals too with natural frolic, sheer joy, boisterous mirth. To do so belongs to the nature of a people as such.

Even the deep seriousness of the Day of Atonement was transformed on the evening of the same day, into light-hearted merriment. "Nothing," we are told, "is more characteristic of the post-exilian cultus, which in contrast with the ancient everywhere directs its view to sin and expiation, than that it culminates and attains its climax in a great festival of the expiation of sin."² The later observance of this day, however, in the garb of mourning, is only as it were a dark shadow of the primitive observance. The observance in the Temple was accomplished in a significant drama which was fascinating from beginning to end. When the high priest came forth from the Most

¹ Sources: Mishna, *Taanith*, sec. iv.; with Neh. x. 35 [A.V. 34]; xiii. 31; Josephus, *B. J.*, ii. 17, § 6; cf. Herzfeld, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 67 sq., 144 sq., ii. 126, 182 sq. Rosenzweig, *Das Jahrhundert nach dem babyl. Exile* (1885), p. 126.

² Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 116.

Holy Place, after the performance of his functions there, this was for the people a consolatory, gladsome sight, for which poetry can find no adequate words: "like the peace-proclaiming arch in painted clouds; like the morning star, when he arises from the eastern twilight; like the sun, when opening his bud, he unfolds in roseate hue."¹ And when he had committed the goat for banishment into the wilderness (the goat for Azazel) to the man who was to conduct it down from the Temple court into the city, this was a highly joyous interlude, to which the people so greatly crowded to see the goat, to pull it, and to chase it, that it and its leader had need of a strong guard for their protection.² And when the solemnity was over, the high priest was escorted with a guard of honour to his dwelling in the city, where a banquet awaited his more immediate friends. The young people, however, cared little about these things, but prepared to repair to the vineyards; for about Jerusalem are mountains, likewise vine-mountains (vineyards)—upon the calcareous mountain ranges of Judæa, and in particular near Jerusalem, grows a wine which surpasses the German, and even the Spanish, in spirit. Twice in the year, on the closing day of the wood-offering and on the Day of Atonement, there was a diversion of dancing in the vineyards.³ The maidens attired themselves all in simple white, in fresh-washen white garments which they had borrowed; the wealthy also were obliged to borrow them, in order that they might not shame the poor. The climax of the enjoyment was reached in the chain-dances; youths and maidens stood facing each other in rows, and moved towards each other in dancing step as they sang; the song was a song of men, but under the refining influence of the important day, the event took the

¹ See my *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* (1836), p. 21 sq.

² Mishna, *Joma*, vi. 3-6.

³ Mishna, *Taanith*, iv. 8; comp. *Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie*, p. 195 sq.

form of a muster, or a choice of brides on a large scale. In the Book of Judges (ch. xxi.) we read that a like dancing festival was held every year by the maidens of Shiloh in the vineyards without the town. This festival is there called the feast of the Lord. Nor was the dance of the daughters of Jerusalem, any more than that of the daughters of Shiloh, without a religious sacredness. On this side, thus, the statement receives no confirmation, that the legislation of the priestly codex has turned the piety, which till then had been habit and custom of the people, into exercises of individuals. It is true, Mosaism has at no stage of its development made dancing a constituent part of the cultus, neither however has it banished it therefrom, but has left it undisturbed, after the Captivity as well as before it, as a habit of the people, hallowed by religious occasions and bearings. Festivals were dances before the exile, and continued to be dances after the exile. History proves this.

For we have still to mention a non plus ultra, the joy of the *Bêt Hashoëba*, or solemnity of the torchlight dance, concerning which the proverb said, that he who had not seen this joy had not seen any joy in his life. The Feast of Tabernacles was, as the festival of the close of harvest, the merriest festival, and was therefore by the inventive popular genius endowed with graceful enlivening rites far beyond that which is prescribed by the letter of the Pentateuchal law. Among these was the illumination of the Temple and the torchlight dance on the minor-holiday nights, upon which a high authority, the royal dancing master at Berlin, Rudolf Voss, in his wonderfully-erudite and noble book, *Der Tanz und seine Geschichte* (1868), bestows the only too great and excessive encomium: "No people on earth is able until the present day to show a dance which, in point of sublimity and magnificence of idea and execution, could be placed on a level with this sacred torch-dance."

When the day of high solemnity with which the festival opens was at an end, priests and Levites put together a double gallery for the spectators in the "court of the women" pertaining to the Temple, the upper for the women and the lower for the men. Upon gigantic candelabra were affixed golden bowls, four to each candelabrum, which were supplied with oil by four young priests by means of ladders placed against them, and in each of these four bowls were laid innumerable wicks. When the lamps which crowned these candelabra began to sparkle and to twinkle, and then in addition the many torches shed their light, not only was the Temple converted as into a sea of flame, but all Jerusalem, to the remotest quarters, was irradiated thereby. It was not women but men, the leading and most honoured men of Jerusalem, who exhibited the spectacle of the torch-dance. They danced with torches, which they hurled into the air and caught again—a skill acquired by long practice, wherein many performed astonishing feats; and with dancing and jugglery alternated choral singing of festal hymns, sometimes also impromptu verses. Music and song resounded incessantly; for upon the fifteen steps leading down from the court of the men to the court of the women stood the Levites, with lyres, harps, cymbals, and many other instruments, and rendered hymn after hymn. Then above the fifteen steps, at the Gate of Nicanor, two priests awaited the first cock-crowing, to announce by threefold trumpet-signal the break of day, with which the libation of the water of Siloah was made to succeed to this nocturnal carnival. Simultaneously with the wine libation at the time of the morning sacrifice, there was poured out upon the altar water drawn from the fountain of Siloah—a sensuous representation of the words of promise: "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation."¹ One

¹ See on the *שמיחת בית השואבה* (torchlight solemnity), Mishna, *Succa*, v. 1-4, and on the *נסך המים* (libation of water), iv. 1, 9 sq., compare Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tmolab*, viii. 12 sq.; *Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie*, p. 194 sq.

of the discourses of Jesus on the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 37-39) was spoken with allusion to this pouring of the water of Siloah.¹

It is no doubt possible that the tabernacles of the closing festival of harvest owe their origin primarily to the custom of repairing to the vineyards and there at the time of harvest of spending the night in the open air.² But was the festive mirth curtailed or falsified by the tabernacles receiving another stamp in commemoration of the huts in which the people liberated from the Egyptian bondage were wont to encamp on the way to Canaan? Such historic significance given to the festivals of nature, so far from burying the natural occasion under a load of rubbish, rather idealises it.³ The Passover, or Easter festival, remained for the Church, as for the people of the Old Testament, a festival of spring; spring in nature avails us as a type of the spring which has dawned in God's kingdom of grace through the resurrection of the Conqueror of death. The Sunday after Easter was called in the early Church the Pasch of Flowers, and Gregory of Nazianzus concludes a sermon on Low Sunday with the words: "It is now natural spring (*ἔαρ κοσμικόν*), spiritual spring; spring for the life of the soul, spring for the life of the body; visible spring, invisible spring."

If you were placed in company with a human being from whose face beams forth to you full and pure love of a kindred soul, in the midst of a magnificent sunset of the Gulf of Naples, and had to choose whether this gracious countenance or this ravishing panorama of nature should grow pale and disappear, your choice would not waver for a moment. The personality of a single human being out-

¹ Even Herzfeld regards this as probable.

² Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 88.

³ Against Wellhausen, *Ibid.*, pp. 95, 105: "Vergeschichtlichung der Feste = Denaturalisation."

weighs the whole unconscious world of nature; and human history is a mirror of the Godhead which reflects the person of God much more deeply and abundantly than the variations in the world of nature. Therefore a festival gains in festivity when it ceases to be a mere festival of nature and becomes an analogous festival of history; as when with the festival of Pentecost, the ancient festival of the vintage, there combines in post-biblical times the festival of the giving of the law,¹ and afterwards that of the founding of the Church, or when with the festival of the winter solstice there is combined the celebration of the more radiant half of the world's history begun with the birth at Bethlehem. The joy in that which is good and glorious in the world of nature suffers no diminution thereby. The self-same Psalm lxxv., which extols God as the controller of history: "By terrible things in righteousness wilt Thou answer us, O God of our salvation," closes in notes of praise: "Thou hast crowned the year with Thy goodness, and Thy paths drip with fatness. The pastures of the wilderness drip, and the hills gird themselves with joy. The meadows have clothed themselves with flocks, and the valleys veil themselves in corn; all things rejoice, all things sing." And Isaiah, standing in spirit at the cradle of the holy Christ, confesses with an upward glance to God, the Giver of the wondrous Child (ix. 3): "One rejoices before Thee according to the joy in harvest." Jubilation of the reapers and sheaf-binders, jubilation of the grape-gatherers and pressers, was and is proverbial.

And as natural joy and dancing, so also joy and dancing over events of history prove to be inseparable in the post-exilian age, as in the præ-exilian. As Miriam, the sister of Moses, as choir-leader of the women celebrates with dancing and music the discomfiture of Pharaoh, and the daughter

¹ See *Pesachim*, 68, where it is said that the observance must be a so much more joyous one on that account.

of Jephthah the victory of her father over the Ammonites, and the women of Jerusalem the victory of Saul and David over the Philistines, so the composer of the sixty-eighth Psalm, which we are to regard forsooth as post-exilian, describes a celebration of victory in the Temple: "They see Thy procession, Elohim, the procession of my God, my King, in the sanctuary. The singers go before, the players on instruments follow after: among them are the damsels playing with timbrels." And in the post-exilian historic fiction of the Book of Judith the whole feminine world engages in dances in honour of the liberatress from Holofernes, all crown themselves with wreaths of olive, and she advances at the head of the women, who, received into the midst of the crowned and praise-singing warriors, enter into the liberated Bethulia.

The legislation of the priestly codex has thus changed nothing in the people's love for dancing. The love of dancing rather increased than fell off in the later as compared with earlier times; for it even laid hold of the worship, without any consciousness of being in contradiction with the law. The very hymn book of the congregation, which is not now allowed to contain anything of a præ-exilian origin,¹ concludes with summoning to the festive dance: "Let them praise His name in the dance: with timbrel and harp let them sing praises unto Him" (Ps. cxlix. 3); and "Praise Him with the timbrel and dance: praise Him with stringed instruments and the pipe!" And just in the latest prophetic pictures of the future does the dance become a characteristic trait. When Jerusalem shall have become the spiritual metropolis of the nations, then shall

¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen* (1884), p. 89: "The Psalms, all of them, belong to the period of the post-exilian Judaism." Stade, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (1881), p. 85: "The psalter is no product of Israelitism, but of the post-exilian Judaism"; and p. 298: "That opinion, that David is the father of the psalm poesy, is a product of the post-exilian Judaism."

she, as is predicted by a Korahite poet and seer in the eighty-seventh Psalm, confess with singing, and moreover with dancing: "All my springs," my fountains of life and joy, "are in Thee." And Jeremiah, the prophet of Anâtâ, who saw the kingdom of Judah sink in ruins and Jerusalem dissolve in flames, consoles his people, inasmuch as God says by him (xxxii. 4): "Again will I build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." Nay, even in the discourses of our Lord and Saviour such images taken from the dance are not wanting. Who knows not the parable of the Prodigal Son? The lost son is the Gentile world, and the elder son, pluming himself on his virtue, is the people of the law. When the lost son has returned to the open arms of his father, the elder son, as he comes homewards, hears with offended surprise *συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν*, that is, as Luther translates, *Gesänge und Reigen*, thus music and dancing (Luke xv. 25). The whole house shares the joy of the father, and is in transports of excitement.

Who could find fault then with me, a Christian theologian, for the nature of my theme? I have taken this opportunity to show for once, by instances given, in presence of an audience which equals that gathered around him by Robertson Smith in Edinburgh and Glasgow and by Kuenen in London and Oxford, that not everything holds water in the newest reconstruction of the præ-Christian history of Israel; and that in relation to it one ought to take up a position not offhand negative, but yet critical, without suffering oneself to be spell-bound. The Book of Ecclesiastes says: "There is a time to mourn and a time to dance," but it is equally true that it is *always* a time for testing. And an old Hebrew proverb¹ says indeed:

¹ אִם בְּמִשְׁתֵּי לִחְנוֹק הַתְּלָה בְּאֵילָן גְּדוֹלָה. See Düker, *Rabbinische Blumenlese* (1844), p. 111.

If you wish to hang yourself, hang yourself upon a great tree ; *i.e.* if you will make yourself dependent on an authority, choose for yourself a great one. The proverb, however, speaks conditionally ; for is it not more advisable, is it not better, not to hang oneself at all ? But enough now of gossip !

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XIX.

THE NEW NATURE WROUGHT OUT IN NEW LIFE.

“ Seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him : where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman ; but Christ is all, and in all.”—Col. iii. 9–11 (Rev. Ver.).

THE limits of the former paper obliged us to break the close connexion between these words and the preceding. They adduce a reason for the moral exhortation going before, which at first sight may appear very illogical. “ Put off these vices of the old nature because you have put off the old nature with its vices,” sounds like, Do a thing because you have done it. But the apparent looseness of reasoning covers very accurate thought which a little consideration brings to light, and introduces a really cogent argument for the conduct it recommends. Nor do the principles contained in the verses now under examination look backward only to enforce the exhortation to put aside these evils. They also look forward, and are taken as the basis of the following exhortation, to put on the white robes of Christ-likeness—which is coupled with this section by “ therefore.”

I. The first thing to be observed is the change of the

spirit's dress, which is taken for granted as having occurred in the experience of all Christians.

We have already found the same idea presented under the form of death and resurrection. The "death" is equivalent to the "putting off of the old," and the "resurrection" to "the putting on of the new man." That figure of a change of dress to express a change of moral character is very obvious, and is frequent in Scripture. Many a psalm breathes prayers like, "Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness." Zechariah in vision saw the high-priestly representative of the nation standing before the Lord "in filthy garments," and heard the command to strip them off him, and clothe him in festival robes, in token that God had "caused his iniquity to pass from him." Christ spoke His parable of the man at the wedding feast without the wedding garment, and of the prodigal, who was stripped of his rags stained with the filth of the swine troughs, and clothed with the best robe. Paul in many places touches the same image, as in his ringing exhortation—clear and rousing in its notes like the morning bugle—to Christ's soldiers, to put off their night gear, "the works of darkness," and to brace on the armour of light, which sparkles in the morning sunrise. Every reformatory and orphanage yields an illustration of the image, where the first thing done is to strip off and burn the rags of the new comers, then to give them a bath and dress them in clean, sweet, new clothes. Most naturally dress is taken as the emblem of character, which is indeed the garb of the soul. Most naturally "habit" means both "costume" and "custom."

But here we have a strange paradox introduced, to the ruining of the rhetorical propriety of the figure. It is a new "man" that is put on. The Apostle does not mind hazarding a mixed metaphor, if it adds to the force of his speech, and he introduces this thought of the new *man*, though it somewhat jars, in order to impress on his readers

that what they have to put off and on is much more truly part of themselves than an article of dress is. The "old man" is the unregenerate self; the new man is, of course, the regenerate self, the new Christian moral nature personified. There is a deeper self which remains the same throughout the change, the true man, the centre of personality; which is, as it were, draped in the moral nature, and can put it off and on. I myself change myself. The figure is vehement, and, if you will, paradoxical, but it expresses accurately and forcibly at once the depth of the change that passes on him who becomes a Christian, and the identity of the person through all change. If I am a Christian, there has passed on me a change so thorough that it is in one aspect a death, and in another a resurrection; in one aspect a putting off not merely of some garb of action, but the old *man*, and in another a putting on not merely of some surface renovation, but of a new *man*—which is yet the same old self.

This entire change is taken for granted by Paul as having been realised in every Christian. It is here treated as having taken place at a certain point of time, namely when these Colossians began to put their trust in Jesus Christ, and as in profession of that trust, and a symbol of that change, were baptized.

Of course the contrast between the character before and after faith in Christ is strongest when, like the Christians at Colossæ, converts have been brought out of heathenism. With us, where some knowledge of Christianity is widely diffused, and its indirect influence has shaped the characters even of those who reject it, there is less room for a marked revolution in character and conduct. There will be many true saints who can point to no sudden change at their conversion; but have grown up, sometimes from childhood, under Christian influences, or who, if they have distinctly been conscious of a change, have passed through it as

gradually as night passes into day. Be it so. In many respects that will be the highest form of experience. Yet even such souls will be aware of a "new man" formed in them which is at variance with their own old selves, and will not escape the necessity of the conflict with their lower nature, the immolation and casting off of the unregenerate self. But there are also many people who have grown up without God or Christ, who must become Christians by the way of sudden conversion, if they are ever to become Christians at all.

Why should such sudden change be regarded as impossible? Is it not a matter of everyday experience that some long ignored principle may suddenly come, like a meteor into the atmosphere, into a man's mind and will, may catch fire as it travels, and if I may say so, explode and blow to pieces the solid habits of a lifetime? And why should not the truth concerning God's great love in Christ, which in too sad certainty is ignored by many, flame in upon blind eyes, and change the look of everything? The New Testament doctrine of conversion asserts that it may and does. It does not insist that everybody must become a Christian in the same fashion. Sometimes there will be a dividing line between the two states, as sharp as the boundary of adjoining kingdoms; sometimes the one will melt imperceptibly into the other. Sometimes the revolution will be as swift as that of the wheel of a locomotive, sometimes slow and silent as the movement of a planet in the sky. The main thing is that the face shall be turned to God whether suddenly or slowly.

But however brought about, this putting off the old sinful self, is a certain mark of a Christian man. It can be assumed as true universally, and appealed to as the basis of exhortations such as those of the context. Believing certain truths does not make a Christian. If there have been any reality in the act by which we have laid hold of

Christ as our Saviour, our whole being will be revolutionized ; old things will have passed away—tastes, desires, ways of looking at the world, memories, habits, pricks of conscience and all cords that bound us to our God-forgetting past—and all things will have become new, because we ourselves move in the midst of them, new creatures with new love burning in our hearts and new motives changing all our lives, and a new aim shining before us, and a new hope illuminating the blackness beyond, and a new song on our lips, and a new power in our hands, and a new Friend by our sides.

This is a wholesome and most needful test for all who call themselves Christians, and who are often tempted to put too much stress on believing and feeling, and to forget the supreme importance of the moral change which true Christianity effects. Nor is it less needful to remember that this resolute casting off of the garment spotted by the flesh, and putting on of the new man, is a consequence of faith in Christ and is only possible as a consequence. Nothing else will strip the foul robes from a man. The moral change comes second, the union with Jesus Christ by faith must come first. To try to begin with the second stage, is like trying to begin building a house at the second story.

But there is a practical conclusion drawn from this taken-for-granted change. Our text is introduced by “seeing that ;” and though some doubts may be raised as to that translation and the logical connexion of the paragraph, it appears on the whole most congruous with both the preceding and the following context, to retain it and to see here the reason for the exhortation which goes before—“Put off all these,” and for that which follows—“Put on, therefore,” the beautiful garment of love and compassion.

That great change, though taking place in the inmost nature whensoever a heart turns to Christ, needs to be wrought out in conduct, and to be wrought into character.

The leaven is in the dough, but to knead it thoroughly into the mass is a lifelong task, which is only accomplished by our own continually repeated efforts. The old garment clings to the limbs like the wet clothes of a half-drowned man, and it takes the work of a lifetime to get quite rid of it. The "old man" dies hard, and we have to repeat the sacrifice hour by hour. The new man has to be put on afresh day by day.

So the apparently illogical exhortation, Put off what you have put off, and put on what you have put on, is fully vindicated. It means, Be consistent with your deepest selves. Carry out in detail what you have already done in bulk. Cast out the enemy, already ejected from the central fortress, from the isolated positions which he still occupies. You *may* put off the old man, for he is put off already; and the confidence that he is will give you strength for the struggle that still remains. You *must* put off the old man, or there is still danger of its again wrapping its poisonous rags about your limbs.

II. We have here, the continuous growth of the new man, its aim and pattern.

The thought of the garment passes for the moment out of sight, and the Apostle enlarges on the greatness and glory of this new man, partly as a stimulus to obeying the exhortation, partly with allusion to some of the errors which he had been combating, and partly because his fervid spirit kindles at the mention of the mighty transformation.

The new man, says he, is "being renewed." This is one of the instances where minute accuracy in translation is not pedantic, but clear gain. When we say, with the Authorised Version, "is renewed," we speak of a completed act; when we say with the Revised Version, "is being renewed," we speak of a continuous process; and there can be no question that the latter is the true idea intended here.

The growth of the new man is constant, perhaps slow and difficult to discern, if the intervals of comparison be short. But like all habits and powers it steadily increases. On the other hand, a similar process works to opposite results in the "old man," which, as Paul says in the instructive parallel passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 22), "waxeth corrupt, after the lusts of deceit." Both grow according to their inmost nature, the one steadily upwards; the other with accelerating speed downwards, till they are parted by the whole distance between the highest heaven and the lowest abyss. So mystic and awful is that solemn law of the persistent increase of the true ruling tendency of a man's nature, and its certain subjugation of the whole man to itself!

It is to be observed that this renewing is represented in this clause, as done *on* the new man, not by him. We have heard the exhortation to a continuous appropriation and increase of the new life by our own efforts. But there is a Divine side too, and the renewing is not merely effected by us, nor due only to the vital power of the new man, though growth is the sign of life there as everywhere, but is "the renewing by the Holy Ghost," whose touch quickens and whose indwelling renovates the inward man day by day. So there is hope for us in our striving, for He helps us; and the thought of that Divine renewal is not a pillow for indolence, but a spur to intenser energy, as Paul well knew when he wove the apparent paradox, "work out your own salvation, for it is God that worketh in you."

The new man is being renewed "*unto* knowledge." An advanced knowledge of God and Divine realities is the result of the progressive renewal. Possibly there may be a passing reference to the pretensions of the false teachers, who had so much to say about a higher wisdom open to the initiated, and to be won by ceremonial and asceticism. Their claims, hints Paul, are baseless; their pretended

secrets a delusion ; their method of attaining them a snare. There is but one way to press into the depths of the knowledge of God—namely growth into His likeness. We understand one another best by sympathy. We know God only on condition of resemblance. “If the eye were not sunlike how could it see the sun?” says a great modern thinker! “If thou beest this, thou seest this,” said an old mystic. Ever, as we grow in resemblance, shall we grow in knowledge, and ever as we grow in knowledge, shall we grow in resemblance. So in perpetual action and reaction of being and knowing, shall we draw nearer and nearer the unapproachable light, and receiving it full on our faces, shall be changed into the same image, as the moonbeams that touch the dark ocean transfigure its waves into silver radiance like their own. For all simple souls, bewildered by the strife of tongues and unapt for speculation, this is a message of gladness, that the way to know God is to be like Him, and the way to be like Him is to be renewed in the inward man, and the way to be renewed in the inward man is to put on Christ. They may wrangle and philosophize who will, but the path to God leads far away from all that. It may be trodden by a child’s foot, and the wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein, for all that is needed is a heart that desires to know Him, and is made like Him by love. Half the secret lies in the great word which tells us that “we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is,” and knowledge will work likeness. The other half lies in the great word which tells us that “blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,” and likeness will work a more perfect knowledge.

This new man is being renewed *after the image of Him that created him*. As in the first creation man was made in the image of God, so in the new creation. From the first moment in which the supernatural life is derived from Christ into the regenerated spirit, that new life is like its

source. It is kindred, therefore it is like, as all derived life is. The child's life is like the father's. But the image of God which the new man bears is more than that which was stamped on man in his creation. That was mainly, if not wholly, the reasonable soul, and the self-conscious personality, the broad distinctions which separate man from other animals. The image of God is often said to have been lost by sin, but Scripture seems rather to consider it as inseparable from humanity, even when stained by transgression. Men are still images of God, though darkened and "carved in ebony." The coin bears His image and superscription, though rusty and defaced. But the image of God, which the new man bears from the beginning in a rudimentary form, and which is continually imprinting itself more deeply upon him, has for its principal feature holiness. Though the majestic infinitudes of God can have no likeness in man, however exalted, and our feebleness cannot copy His strength, nor our poor blind knowledge, with its vast circumference of ignorance, be like His un-growing and unerring knowledge, we may be "holy as He is holy"; we may be "imitators of God as beloved children, and walk in love as He hath loved us"; we may "*walk* in the light as He *is* in the light," with only the difference between His calm, eternal being, and our changeful and progressive motion therein; we may even "be perfect as our Father is perfect." This is the end of all our putting off the old and putting on the new. This is the ultimate purpose of God, in all His self-revelation. For this Christ has come and died and lives. For this the Spirit of God dwells in us. This is the immortal hope with which we may recreate and encourage our souls in our often weary struggles. Even our poor sinful natures may be transformed into that wondrous likeness. Coal and diamond are but varying forms of carbon, and the blackest lump dug from the deepest mine, may be transmuted by

the alchemy of that wondrous transforming union with Christ, into a brightness that shall flash back all the glory of the sunlight, and gleam for ever, set in one of His many crowns.

III. We have here finally the grand unity of this new creation.

We may reverse the order of the words as they stand here, and consider the last clause first, inasmuch as it is the reason for the doing away of all distinctions of race, or ceremony, or culture, or social condition.

“Christ is all.” Wherever that new nature is found, it lives by the life of Christ. He dwells in all who possess it. The Spirit of life in Christ is in them. His blood passes into their veins. The holy desires, the new tastes, the kindling love, the clearer vision, the gentleness and the strength, and whatsoever things beside are lovely and of good report, are all His—nay, we may say, are all Himself.

And, of course, all who are His are partakers of that common gift, and He is *in* all. There is no privileged class in Christ's Church, as these false teachers in Colossæ had taught. Against every attempt to limit the universality of the Gospel, whether it came from Jewish Pharisees or Eastern philosophers, Paul protested with his whole soul. He has done so already in this Epistle, and does so here in his emphatic assertion that Christ was not the possession of an aristocracy of “intelligence,” but belonged to every soul that trusted Him.

Necessarily, therefore, surface distinctions disappear. There is triumph in the roll of his rapid enumeration of these clefts that have so long kept brothers apart, and are now being filled up. He looks round on a world, the antagonisms of which we can but faintly imagine, and his eye kindles and his voice rises into vibrating emotion, as he thinks of the mighty magnetism that is drawing enemies towards the one centre in Christ. His catalogue here may

profitably be compared with his other in the Epistle to the Galatians (iii. 28). There he enumerates the three great distinctions which parted the old world—race (Jew and Greek), social condition (bond and free), and sex (male and female). These, he says, as separating powers, are done away in Christ. Here the list is modified, probably with reference to the errors in the Colossian Church.

“There cannot be Greek and Jew.” The cleft of national distinctions, which certainly never yawned more widely than between the Jew and every other people, ceases to separate, and the teachers who had been trying to perpetuate that distinction in the Church were blind to the very meaning of the Gospel. “Circumcision and uncircumcision” separated. Nothing makes deeper and bitterer antagonisms than differences in religious forms, and people who have not been born into them are usually the most passionate in adherence to them, so that cleft did not entirely coincide with the former. “Barbarian, Scythian,” is not an antithesis but a climax—the Scythians were looked upon as the most savage of barbarians. The Greek contempt for the outside races, which is reflected in this clause, was largely the contempt for a supposed lower stage of culture. As we have seen, Colossæ especially needed the lesson that differences in culture disappeared in the unity of Christ, for the heretical teachers attached great importance to the wisdom which they professed to teach. A cultivated class is always tempted to superciliousness, and a half cultivated class is even more so. There is abundance of that arrogance born of education among us to-day, and sorely needing and quite disbelieving the teaching that there are things which can make up for the want of what it possesses. It is in the interest of the humble virtues of the uneducated godly as well as of the nations called uncivilized that Christianity wars against that most heartless and ruinous of all prides, the pride of culture, by its pro-

clamation that in Christ, Barbarian, Scythian, and most polished thinker or scholar are one.

“Bondman, freedman” is again an antithesis. That gulf between master and slave was indeed wide and deep; too wide for compassion to cross, though not for hatred to stride over. The untold miseries of slavery in the old world are but dimly known; but it and war and the degradation of women made an infernal trio which crushed more than half the race into a hell of horrors. Perhaps Paul may have been the more ready to add this clause to his catalogue because his thoughts had been occupied with the relation of master and slave on the occasion of the letter to Philemon which was sent along with this to Colossæ.

Christianity waged no direct war against these social evils of antiquity, but it killed them much more effectually by breathing into the conscience of the world truths which made their continuance impossible. It girdled the tree, and left it to die—a much better and more thorough plan than dragging it out of the ground by main force. Revolution cures nothing. The only way to get rid of evils engrained in the constitution of society is to elevate and change the tone of thought and feeling, and then they die of atrophy. Change the climate, and you change the vegetation. Until you do, neither mowing nor uprooting will get rid of the foul growths.

So the Gospel does with all these lines of demarcation between men. What becomes of them? What becomes of the ridges of sand that separate pool from pool at low water? The tide comes up over them and makes them all one, gathered into the oneness of the great sea. They may remain, but they are seen no more, and the roll of the wave is not interrupted by them. The powers and blessings of the Christ pass freely from heart to heart, hindered by no barriers. Christ founds a deeper unity independent of all these superficial distinctions, for the very conception of

humanity is the product of Christianity, and the true foundation for the brotherhood of mankind is the revelation in Christ of the fatherhood of God. Christ is the brother of us all; His death is for every man, the blessing of His Gospel is offered to each; He will dwell in the heart of any. Therefore all distinctions, national, ceremonial, intellectual or social, fade into nothingness. Love is of no nation, and Christ is the property of no aristocracy in the Church. That great truth was a miraculous new thing in that old world, all torn apart by deep clefts like the grim cañons of American rivers. Strange it must have seemed to find slaves and their masters, Jew and Greek, sitting at one table and bound in fraternal ties. The world has not yet fully grasped that truth, and the Church has wofully failed in showing it to be a reality. But it arches above all our wars, and schisms, and wretched class distinctions, like a rainbow of promise beneath whose open portal the world shall one day pass into that bright land where the wandering peoples shall gather together in peace round the feet of Jesus, and there shall be one fold because there is one Shepherd.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE SECOND BOOK OF THE KINGS.

iv. 10. Marg., *a little chamber with walls*. So the Genevan: cf. Coverdale (after Luther), *a little chamber of boordes*: "which" (as the Genevan note explains) "should be separate from the rest of the house, that he might more commodiously give him selfe to study and prayers."

v. 26. The A.V. and text follow the LXX. in taking the clause interrogatively, and supplying *with thee*. The marginal rendering supposes that Elisha ironically repeats Gehazi's לֹא הָלַךְ , *went not*. *My heart*, i.e. prophetic consciousness, *went not* from me, did not desert me.

viii. 10. The text *unto him* renders the K'ri לֵּה , which is supported by all the versions. The margin, *say, Thou shalt not recover*, renders the C'thib לֹא . But the K'ri is certainly right. There is nothing to justify the exceptional position of the negative before the infinitive: a negative clause would naturally be followed by פִּי , not by וְ ; and Hazael's report in v. 14 does not contain the negative. לֵּה , if not a mere error of sound, was perhaps inserted in the text by some one who wished to save the prophet's character for veracity. But clearly Elisha, reading Hazael's character and purpose, ironically bids him carry back a courtier's flattering answer, such as he would naturally wish to do. What use was it for him to come to consult the prophet, when he had already determined in his own mind what was to be the issue of his master's illness?

13. *What is thy servant, which is but a dog*, etc. The A.V. is ungrammatical. Hazael does not resent the imputation of barbarous cruelty and hostility to Israel, but, with mock humility, disclaims the possibility of one so contemptible as himself attaining to such power.

ix. 1. *Vial*. So the A.V. in 1 Sam. x. 1 for כַּף .

x. 12. *At the shearing house*. בֵּית עֶקֶר means literally *house of binding*, and this is supposed to mean binding for the purpose of shearing: but this explanation seems far-fetched, and the margin, *house of gathering*, i.e. a well-known rendezvous for the shepherds of the district, is more probable. It is the rendering of the Targum, and the idea of *gathering* is easily derived from that of *binding*.

xi. 2. *In the bedchamber* is apt to mislead; hence the marg. *chamber of the beds*. It was not the sleeping apart-

ment, but a store room in the palace, in which mattresses, coverlets, etc., were kept, where the child could be most conveniently concealed until he could be removed to the Temple.

4. *Carites*, marg. *executioners*. The name כָּרִי is met with only in this chapter (v. 19) and in 2 Sam. xx. 23, C'thib. Its meaning, like that of the kindred terms *Cherethites* and *Pelethites*, is disputed. The termination י- is usually gentile; but would foreign mercenaries, it is urged, have been employed as a body-guard? and the word is coupled with רָצִים, *runners*, which makes it more natural to treat it as an appellative. Some commentators accordingly, including Gesenius, Keil, and Thenius, derive the word from כור, *to pierce*, and take it to mean *executioners*=*the body-guard*. Cf. טַבָּחִים, *slaughterers*=*body-guard*. The A.V. *captains* is the rendering of Kimchi and others, who explain כָּרִי=כָּרִים, *rams* metaphorically of *leaders*. But the construction shows plainly that כָּרִים and רָצִים denotes the troops officered by the centurions previously mentioned.

8. *Ranks*, of the guard drawn up about the king. Athaliah was conducted out "between the ranks" of the guard (v. 15). A.V. *ranges* apparently follows the Vulg. *septum templi*. Cf. Luther, *zwischen die Wand*: and Coverdale's *within the wall*.

12. *Gave him* is not in the original, the literal rendering of which is, as in the margin, *put upon him the crown and the testimony*. Some therefore suppose that the book of the law was not placed in the new king's hands but laid on his head, to symbolize his submission to it; others, but without good reason, explain הָעֲדוּת to mean the royal robes, or the insignia of royalty.

14. Marg. *on the platform*. LXX. ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου, *upon the pillar*: Vulg. *super tribunal*. Cf. chap. xxiii. 3.

16. *They made way for her*. So LXX. in 2 Chron. xxiii. 15 (but not here), and Targum. The word יָדִים

means *room on both sides*. The A.V. follows LXX. and Vulg., but this rendering would require יָר for יָרִים and בָּהּ for לָהּ.

xii. 4. *In current money*. So most modern commentators, and [לִסְחֹר] עֵבֶר בָּקָף has this meaning in Gen. xxiii. 16. But why should *current money* be specified? The answer that it was required for the payment of the workmen is hardly sufficient. One expects to have one of the sources of revenue mentioned; and the marginal rendering, which takes עֵבֶר as an abbreviated expression for כָּל-הָעֵבֶר עַל הַפְּקָדִים, *every one that passeth over unto them that are numbered* (Ex. xxx. 13, 14), deserves more consideration than is generally accorded to it. So the A.V. following Jewish authorities.

The money of the persons for whom each man is rated. The redemption money to be paid for the first-born (Num. xviii. 16), and by those who had made vows for themselves or those belonging to them, which in the latter case was a variable sum, differently "estimated" according to age, sex, and ability to pay (Lev. xxvii. 2 ff.).

xvi. 6. Marg. *Edomites*. So the K'ri, LXX., and Vulg. If this reading is adopted, and it is probably right, we must go further, and read לְאֶדֶם, *to Edom*, for לְאֶרֶם, *to Syria*. There is no proof that Elath had ever belonged to Syria, and Rezin's object was to secure the help of Edom against Judah.

xviii. 4. Marg. *it was called*, supplying an indefinite subject to נִקְרָא. So Luther *man hiess*, and Coverdale. According to this interpretation, *Nehushtan* was the popular name of the brazen serpent, not a contemptuous term applied to it by Hezekiah.

xix. 7. *I will put a spirit in him*. Cf. Coverdale: *I wil put him in another mynde*: i.e. inspire him with such a spirit that he will change his plans and retreat. The "rumour" seems to refer to the tidings of Tirhakah's ad-

vance (v. 9) rather than to the report of the destruction of the army.

23. The text *multitude* follows the K'ri בָּרֵב : the marg. *driving* follows the C'thib בִּרְכָב. The former has the support of the parallel passage in Isa. xxxvii. 24, and of all the versions ; and the latter, though preferred by some editors as the more difficult reading, is probably only a scribe's error.

24. *Will I dry up all the rivers of Egypt.* The tense is future. Egypt was not yet conquered, but it was the real goal towards which the Assyrian expedition was directed. The word for *rivers* is יְאֵרִי, which specially denotes the Nile with its branches and canals. The word for *Egypt*, as in Isa. xix. 6, is מִצְרַיִם not מִצְרָיִם. This is generally understood to mean Lower as distinguished from Upper Egypt ; and this form of the name may have been chosen here allusively, because it also means *fortification*.

31. Marg. of *hosts*, מַלְאָכָיו, is קרי ולא כתיב, "read though not written," according to the Massoretic note. Its insertion is supported by some MSS., the parallel in Isaiah, and all versions. *His sons* in v. 37 is also "read though not written." The A. V. is inconsistent in printing of *hosts* in italics, but not *his sons*, for the two words stand on the same footing as regards insertion or omission.

xx. 4. *The middle part of the city.* So the C'thib, הָעִיר הַתְּיִלָּה. But the K'ri הֶצֶר, *court*, given in the margin, has the support of all the versions. The absence of the article, though irregular, is not decisive against this reading, which gives a more striking sense. Before Isaiah had left the precincts of the palace, the Divine message came to him.

9. *Shall the shadow*, etc. Hezekiah's answer seems to require this sense, which is expressed by all the versions : but it is difficult to see how the Hebrew text can be rendered otherwise than as in the margin. Perhaps the text is corrupt.

xxii. 14. *In the second quarter.* It is generally agreed that קִיָּצָה here and in Zeph. i. 10, denotes a particular quarter of Jerusalem. *College* of the A.V. is derived from the Jewish commentators, who follow the Targum, which renders בֵּית אוֹלָפְנָה, *house of instruction*, deriving the word from the post-biblical sense of שָׁנָה, *to teach*.

xxiii. 11. *The precincts, namely, of the Temple.* פְּרָר here is the same as פְּרָרָר in 1 Chron. xxvi. 18, where some part of the Temple buildings is evidently meant.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES.

ii. 23. *And Geshur and Aram took the towns of Jair from them.* So the Genevan rightly: *And Geshur with Aram tooke the townes of Jair from them*: with the marginal note: "That is, the Geshurites and Syrians tooke the townes from Jairs children." The Geshurites were Jair's close neighbours, Deut. iii. 14.

iii. 17. *The captive*, marg. *Assir*. In rendering אֲסִיר as a proper name the A.V. follows the LXX., Vulg., and some Jewish commentators, e.g. Kimchi. But if Jeconiah had a son *Assir* who was the father of Shealtiel, according to the usage of vv. 10-17, we should expect the addition of בְּנוֹ, *his son*, after *Assir*: and if Shealtiel was Assir's brother, the name Shealtiel should be preceded by *and*, and *his son* omitted after it. The Hebrew accentuation which joins אֲסִיר to יְכֹנְיָה is in favour of the Revisers' rendering, and the absence of the article is not a fatal objection to it.

iv. 17, 18. *His wife the Jewess*, whose name is not given, is contrasted with Mered's Egyptian wife Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh. But the text as it stands hardly makes sense: and it seems necessary, with Bertheau and Keil, to transpose the clauses and read: *And the sons of Ezrah; Jether, and Mered, and Ephraim, and Jalon. And*

these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took; and she bare Miriam and Shammai, and Ishbah the father of Eshtemoa. And his wife the Jewess bare, etc.

41. *The Meunim.* Cf. 2 Chr. xxvi. 7 and xx. 1 marg. *That were found there*, implies that they were settlers who had come to this neighbourhood from their original home, which was probably *Maon*, near Petra, south of the Dead Sea.

vi. 28. *The firstborn Joel and the second Abiah.* So the text must certainly be emended from the Syriac and some MSS. of the LXX., in conformity with v. 33, and 1 Sam. viii. 2. The name *Joel* having fallen out of the text by accident, the Hebrew word יִשְׁנִי and [the] second (for the absence of the article cf. chap. iii. 1) was vocalised יִשְׁנִי, *Vashni*, as though it were the name of Samuel's eldest son, and an *and* prefixed to *Abiah*. The error is as old as the LXX., which has ὁ πρωτότοκος Σανὶ καὶ Ἀβιά. The Vulg. has *Vasseni*.

57. *The cities of refuge, Hebron.* So the Massoretic text. The A. V. follows some of the printed editions, which, apparently without MS. authority, insert יהודה after ערי. But here and in v. 67, the plural ערי, *cities*, seems to be an error for עיר, *city*, for in the one case only Hebron, and in the other only Shechem, was a city of refuge. The singular is read in the corresponding passage, Josh. xxi. 13, 21.

xi. 11. *The thirty, marg., the captains.* The Revisers follow the C'thib, השלשים, i.e. השלישים, which is supported by LXX., Vulg., and Syr. Cf. vv. 15, 25, and xii. 18. The A. V. and marg. follow the K'ri in reading השלישים. Cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 8.

xii. 14. The text (cf. A. V. marg.) is certainly right, though the A. V. and marg. have the support of the Vulg. Literally rendered the words stand: *one for a hundred was the small, and the great for a thousand.* The emphatic *one*,

the order of the words contrasting *one* and a *hundred*, and the preposition ל not על, are decisive as to the meaning. Cf. Lev. xxvi. 8; Deut. xxxii. 30.

xvi. 7. *On that day did David first ordain to give thanks, for On that day David delivered first this psalm to thank, etc.* So understood, the Chronicler's words are a statement that Asaph and his brethren were then first put in charge of the musical services of praise; not that David was the author of the thanksgiving which follows. That ode is a cento from Psalms cv., xvi., cvii., cvi., all of them almost certainly of later date, and is inserted as a thanksgiving suitable for the occasion, though not necessarily the one actually used. It is thought by some to be a later insertion in the book, and not part of the original work.

xxi. 1. *Satan*, marg. *an adversary*. The absence of the definite article is generally understood to indicate that at the time of the compilation of Chronicles שָׁטָן had come to be used as a proper name; but the marginal rendering is grammatically possible, leaving the precise source of the "hostile influence" (as we should say) undetermined.

xxvi. 18. With marg. *the Precinct* cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 11.

xxvi. 20. There can be little doubt that the reading of the LXX. given in the margin is correct. It involves the addition of a single letter only, so far as consonants are concerned, אַחיהם for אחיה. Ahijah is nowhere else mentioned in these chapters; and with the change the verse becomes an intelligible superscription to the list in vv. 21-28.

xxvii. 32. *Uncle*. This is the usual meaning of דוד; but if Jonathan is to be identified with Jonathan the son of Shimea, David's brother (chap. xx. 7), the word must here mean, as is suggested in the margin, *brother's son*. Cf. the use of אח, *brother*, for *nephew*.

xxviii. 12. *By the spirit*, marg. *in his spirit*. The plan of the Temple is attributed to Divine inspiration in v. 19,

but here David's spirit, i.e. mind, is probably meant, and the margin is preferable. So the LXX., Vulg., Coverdale and the Genevan.

xxix. 7. *Darics for drams.* The translators of the A.V. apparently understood the word אֲדָרְכֹנִים, 'adarkōnim, occurring only here and in Ezra viii. 27, and the similar word דִּרְכָּנִים (Ezra ii. 69; Neh. vii. 70 ff.), to be the equivalent of the Greek δραχμή, and this view is still maintained by some. But there is little doubt that the Revisers are right in regarding it as the Greek δαρεικός, a Persian gold coin, value about £1. 2s., first struck by Darius son of Hystaspes, and current in Western Asia long after the fall of the Persian empire. The chronicler uses the standard which was familiar to his contemporaries.

THE SECOND BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES.

i. 5. *Was there.* Heb. שָׁם, shām. So some MSS., the LXX., and Vulg. Marg. *he had put*, Heb. שִׁם, sīm. So most MSS., and the Syr. But the text is obviously right. The position of the brazen altar at Gibeon is mentioned to account for Solomon's going to Gibeon to sacrifice. Possibly the punctuation שָׁם is due to a reminiscence of Exod. xl. 29.

13. *Came from his journey to the high place.* This rendering of the A.V. retained by the Revisers gives the sense sufficiently, but is grammatically impossible. The Massoretic text means, *came to the high place*, and must obviously be corrected by the help of the LXX. and Vulg., as in the margin, *came from the high place*.

ii. 13. *Of Hiram my father's.* The marginal rendering, *even Hiram my father*, which follows LXX. and Vulg., is probably right. The name of king Hiram's father was Abibaal; and Hiram here denotes the master-workman who was the king's namesake. The ל is the sign of the accusative, and *father* is a title of honour. Cf. chap. iv. 16, where Hiram is called Solomon's father, and Gen. xlv. 8.

xi. 15. *He-goats*, marg. *satyrs*. Cf. Lev. xvii. 7. Demons, supposed by popular superstition to take the form of goats, are probably meant. They were thought to haunt desolate places. See Isa. xiii. 21 ; xxxiv. 14. The A.V. follows the Vulg. *daemoniorum*.

xix. 8. *And they returned to Jerusalem*, namely, the king and his attendants, who had gone on the mission of reformation, v. 4. The A.V. is ungrammatical.

xx. 1. *Some of the Ammonites*. So the Massoretic text ; but what can this mean, immediately after *the Ammonites* ? If however we transpose a single letter, we get כַּהֲמֵעִינִים, of the *Meunim*, for כַּהֲעֵמֹנִים, a change supported by the LXX. Cf. 1 Chron. iv. 41 ; 2 Chron. xxvi. 7.

2. *From Syria*. Surely כְּאֶדֶם, *from Edom*, must be read in place of כְּאֶרֶם, and a note to that effect should have been given in the margin. The invaders, marching round the south end of the Dead Sea, would naturally be described as coming *from Edom* ; but *from Syria* is quite out of place. Probably however the Revisers were unwilling to admit a conjectural emendation, unsupported by external evidence, even to the margin.

25. *Dead bodies*. The words cannot be rendered as in the A.V., and the mention of *dead bodies* between *riches* and *precious jewels* is strange. The marginal alternative, *garments*, supported by a few MSS. and the Vulg., is probably right. פָּנִים was confused with בָּגָדִים by a combination of errors of sight and sound. The reader's eye mistook ד for ר, and his ear then substituted פ for ב.

34. *The history of Jehu the son of Hanani, which is inserted in the book of the kings of Israel*. An interesting note of the way in which the larger histories were compiled by the combination of the smaller works of various authors.

xxiv. 27. *The greatness of the burdens laid upon him*, i.e. the sum exacted by the Syrians. Cf. chap. xvii. 11 for this sense of מִשָּׂא. But the obscure רַב הַמִּשָּׂא may also be ex-

plained as in the margin, *the greatness, or number, of the burdens, or prophetic utterances, against him.* Cf. v. 19.

xxxii. 1. *This faithfulness*, the same Heb. word, **הַאֲמִתָּה**, as in xxxi. 20.

xxxiii. 11. *In chains.* So the LXX. and Vulg. Or, as **חֹךְ** literally means *a hook*, the reference may be to the hooks which the Assyrians passed through the noses or lips of prisoners. Cf. 2 Kings xix. 23. The A.V. *among the thorns*, i.e. hiding in some thicket, is hardly probable, though *thorns* is the ordinary meaning of **הוֹחִים**, and 1 Sam. xiii. 6 offers a parallel.

19. *Hozai.* **חֹזַי**, if the text is sound, appears to be a proper name. So the Vulg. But the Sept. renders *the seers*, and it may be a corruption for **הַחֲזִיִּים**, v. 18.

THE BOOK OF EZRA.

i. 3. Marg. *He is the God that is in Jerusalem.* So the LXX., Vulg., Luther, Coverdale, and the Genevan. The order of the words is in favour of this rendering.

iv. 2. Marg. *yet we do no sacrifice since*, etc., following the C'thib **וְלֹא**. But this reading involves a grammatical solecism, for **לֹא** cannot stand before the participle as a verbal form. The K'ri **וְלוֹ**, *and unto him*, is clearly right, and is supported by all the ancient versions.

8. Marg. *Aramaic for Chaldee.* The name *Chaldee*, which has commonly been employed since the time of Jerome to denote the south-western dialect of the Aramæan branch of the Semitic family of languages, is unsuitable, because the ancient Chaldæans or Babylonians never used the language. It is called in the O.T. **אַרְמֵית**, *Aramaic* or *Syrian*, and is now generally termed *Aramaic*, to distinguish it from the north-eastern Aramæan, or Syriac. It was the language of commerce and intercourse in Western Asia, and after the exile gradually came to be the popular language of Palestine.

10 ff. *Beyond the river.* In the trans-Euphratensian provinces, from the point of view of the Persian court. Cf. note on 1 Kings iv. 24.

14. *Eat the salt of the palace.* A general phrase, expressing dependence on and allegiance to the king.

v. 4. *Then spake we.* It is hard to see how this makes sense, for the question, "What are the names of the men that make this building?" is meaningless except in the mouth of Tattenai and his companions. It seems necessary to follow the LXX. and Syriac in reading אֲכָרִי or אֲכָרוּ, *spake they*, for אֲכָרְנָא.

vii. 12. *Perfect.* The word נָכִיר occurs here only, and is of uncertain meaning. It is however probably applied to Ezra as a title of honour. Cf. Vulg. *doctissimo*. The A.V. is a conjecture, based perhaps on *χαίρειν* in 1 Esdras viii. 9.

x. 15. *Only Jonathan . . . and Jahzeiah stood up against this matter.* The exceptive particle אֵךְ, and the statement of v. 16, decide in favour of this rendering against the A.V. and margin. For עָבַד עָלַי, *to oppose*, cf. 1 Chron. xxi. 1; 2 Chron. xx. 23; Dan. xi. 14.

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

iii. 8, iv. 2. Ewald (*Hist.* v. 154, E.T.) maintains that עִיב must in these two passages be "a technical builder's word," having some such meaning as *fortify*. But elsewhere עִיב means *to forsake*; hence the marginal alternatives. The probable meaning of iii. 8 will then be that the repairers left the specified part of the wall untouched as not needing restoration.

iv. 23. *Every one went with his weapon to the water.* The clause אִישׁ שְׁלָחוּ הַכִּיָּם is obscure, and can hardly be complete. The A.V., following the Vulg. *unusquisque tantum nudabatur ad baptismum*, and some Jewish commentators, understand שְׁלָחוּ to mean *his putting off*, or *he put them off* (perf. Piel, with sing. collective suff. referring to בְּגָדֵינוּ).

But שְׁלָחוֹ no doubt means, as in v. 17 (Heb. 11), *his weapon* (from שָׁלַח), and some verb must have fallen out, or the text be otherwise faulty. Maurer's explanation, *every one's weapon was water*, i.e. served instead of his customary ablutions, is more ingenious than probable. The clause is omitted in the LXX. Rödiger emends בְּיָדוֹ for הַיָּמִים, *every one had his weapon in his hand*; others, following the Syriac and Arabic, *every man was with his weapon a full month*.

vi. 11. Marg., *could go into the temple and live*, i.e. being a layman, enter the sanctuary with impunity. Cf. Num. xviii. 7; and for the construction, Exod. xxxiii. 20.

ix. 17. In the Hebrew text the word בְּמִקְרָם, *in their rebellion*, stands somewhat strangely at the end of the sentence; lit. *and appointed a captain to return to their bondage in their rebellion*. But some Hebrew MSS. and the LXX. read בְּמִצְרַיִם, *in Egypt*, for בְּמִקְרָם, *in the rebellion*; and a comparison of Num. xiv. 4, on which the passage is based, leaves little doubt that this is the true reading.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

IV. THE FLYING ROLL AND THE EPHAH.—ZECH. v.

THE preceding visions have given to Zechariah and the people assurance that the Temple and city shall be rebuilt; that the old offices which had formerly secured the well-being of Israel should again be established; that a new era in Church and State was opening under the good guidance of God. There was promise given of a perfectly organized community. Was this not enough? Alas, no! The sickening thought must at once have arisen in the Prophet's mind, What can even this avail so long as the people are what they are? Build a house with every

appliance for comfort, finish it in the best style, and then invite into it a family that has been used to a hovel, and your fine house will soon be filthy and uninhabitable. Put a foolish, incompetent, pleasure-seeking lad into a flourishing business, and he will soon bring it down to his own level, and wreck both it and himself. God makes a heaven for us, but by our very entrance into it we make it a hell. So, thinks the Prophet, here is a land restored to us, a land in which we are to have every advantage, in which our civil government and our religious institutions are to be simply the form in which God's presence and care for us are manifested; but what avails all this, if the people remain just what they were before God swept them out of their land? This thought of the Prophet, these visions are sent to meet or to anticipate. For they assure him that the land shall be purged of sin and evil doers.

The form in which this was announced to Zechariah was peculiar and not at first sight easily intelligible. The Prophet saw what he took to be a huge sheet of parchment, such as the law was written on, flying through the air; and this was explained to be the curse sent forth by God against thieves and perjured persons. It was in the form of a writing, to denote that it was deliberately uttered and would stand. It was thirty feet by fifteen, probably to convey the impression that a large number of sins and curses were specified in it. It was flying, as if hovering like a bird of prey, or sweeping over the land unhindered in its pursuit of its object. It was to drive forth or purge out from the land every sinner specified on the one side of it or on the other—thief or liar. And it was to come into the house of the offender, and like a pestilence, a dry rot, or a fire, it was utterly to consume the very fabric of his home, so that he should be quite blotted out. That is to say, the community was to be cleansed by the destruction of individuals. In ancient times, when pestilence,

bad harvests, reverses in war, fell upon any people, they concluded that some members of the community had committed flagrant crime, and they set themselves to discover and banish such wrong-doers, and so purify the nation. God here assures the Prophet that he will use this method, that His curse will go forth in a visible form and exterminate the sinners so as to leave the community stainless.

The succeeding vision has a similar meaning. Wickedness in the form of a woman is pressed down into an ephah and held in by a cover of lead, and like an evil beast in a cage, is hurried away into a godless land and fixed immovably there. It is remarkable, however, that an ephah should be used for conveying her away—not a simple box, not a cage, but a large wooden measure. The ephah may be used here as the symbol of trade and commerce, just as scales or a ship are sometimes used as their emblem now; and it may be intended that the thieving and lying against which the curse was directed were chiefly to be found among the mercantile men and traders. Or the measure may mean that the wickedness of the people was an ascertained quantity, that all the sins of individuals, the petty cheatings and white lies and equivocations and plausible statements had gone into an accurate standard measure, were counted, weighed, and taken note of. The Prophet could not make out what was in the ephah until the leaden disc was lifted; then he saw a woman, the personification of wickedness; wickedness full-grown, seductive, plotting, prolific; wickedness come to a head, filling up the measure.

Then appeared two winged women who bore away the ephah, rapidly and as it were without effort; “the wind was in their wings,” and they sailed on the breeze as large-winged birds do. This was easy to them for “they had wings like the wings of the stork,” whose long black

wings stretching out from its white body have not only a striking and beautiful effect, but enable it to soar high and fly immense distances. In its annual migration it covers a longer distance than from Judæa to Shinar.

The first truth, then, which this double vision brings before us is this: that the prosperity of a community, or a happy and thriving social condition, depends not only on outward tokens of God's favour, such as good harvests, freedom from epidemics, successes in war or diplomacy; not only on possessing the best possible form of government and an ecclesiastical condition of which neither radical nor conservative can complain; but also, and mainly, on the sound moral character of the people themselves, on the sense of honour they carry with them into all their dealings, the principle and high tone which characterize their daily life. Church and State may be organized on the best possible principles; Joshua and Zerubbabel may both be assured of God's favour, and yet the social condition of the people may be rotten to the core; and until the members of the community are men of honesty and good faith, there is no kingdom of God upon earth. It is not by issuing a proclamation at the town-cross, nor by passing one or two new laws, nor by appointing one or two new government officials, nor by a touch or two here and there throughout the land to hide nuisances and abolish old grievances, that a community can be regenerated. No such swift and easy processes are once thought of by God as sufficient. He declares His favour for this land, but does not suppose that thus He will finish all abuses and perfect reform. He immediately follows this up with the most keen-sighted, closely scrutinizing investigation, and the most thorough-going treatment of evil-doers in practical matters.

This reminds us in the first place that we may depend too much on well-devised legislation and the machinery of government for the prevention of crime. It is after all only

indirectly that law acts towards the repression of vice. It can directly take cognizance of crime only after it has been committed; and the punishment of the criminal *may* indeed deter others—although in some savage islands where there is no law there is a much greater respect for property than among ourselves. But it is a helpless way of dealing with crime, to deal only with the convicted; to lift up the sword or the lash only after the evil has been done. This surely is to lock the door after the horse is stolen; it is to lay out cemeteries and make provision for the dead by way of preventing disease. And in point of fact no laws, regulations, or supervision will ever prevent dishonesty. You may have admirable machinery, an elaborate system of checks making fraud immeasurably more difficult, but you must always leave much in the hands of individuals. No system is absolutely self-acting; and wherever you admit a human hand, you admit the possibility of fraud. You may make it more difficult and more discreditable and perilous for men to cheat you, but you will never make it impossible. Of course it ought to be made difficult. For the sake of the young, and of those who are under great temptation, every obstacle should be laid in the way of dishonesty; otherwise we tempt men and lead them into needless trials. At the same time men are not machines, and if it were possible to remove all opportunity of fraud, this would merely be equivalent to removing all opportunity for the education of conscience, for the development of trustworthiness and self-control, and that strength of character which comes of keeping one's hands clean where the temptation to soil them has been exceptionally strong. The life of a man in trade or business is eminently fitted to develop, and let us most thankfully acknowledge often does develop, many of the most valuable and admirable qualities in human character—a manly patience under reverses, a generous consideration of others in their time of straitened

circumstances, ability to face and manage the actual facts and persons which this world presents, and to carry oneself among them guided always by the private voice of conscience, rising superior to public opinion, to prevalent custom, to mere greed, selfishness, and excitement. These are valuable qualities, qualities which are the very salt of our community, but they are qualities not easily arrived at. They are qualities with a history at their back, a history of years of discipline, of evenings and nights of anxious thought, of long periods when the evil suggestion came back in hours of weakness and had to be thrust aside in these times of weakness with pain and difficulty. They are qualities most distinctively and peculiarly moral, the well-deserved result of moral trial, and therefore impossible if the social system were reduced to a mere machine in which no man could do wrong or turn out a failure.

But under the strain of temptation the double sin of theft and lying is constantly produced. Fraudulent covetousness, underhand selfishness, is still the too common result of the probation which our social condition necessarily institutes. And the curse of God is directed against this double sin, because from its very nature it frequently evades the punishment society would inflict. It is notorious that it is difficult to deal with many forms of fraud as sharply as the public instinct feels they ought to be dealt with. Spectators are filled with burning indignation when they see the far-reaching and long-drawn calamity with which innocent persons are overwhelmed through the preposterous self-confidence and unscrupulous greed of a few men puffed up by commercial vanity or blinded and hardened by insatiable lust of money.

But there is no such thing as successful sin. In one way or other the sin of the sinner finds him out. And impressive as are the terms in which the curse against such sins is here pronounced, it becomes tenfold more so when inter-

preted in the light of its fulfilment in actual instances ; in which all that a man has built up around himself and that he has made himself a liar and a thief to secure, is visited with utter and irreparable ruin. There is many a household that can tell you what is meant by these words : " It shall abide in the midst of his house and shall consume it with the timber thereof and the stones thereof." It means that the clever financier is overtaken by reverses which make investigation necessary, and is exposed as foolish, unscrupulous, disreputable. Or it means that the children in whom he used to find comfort, who knew nothing of the stories told of him, and in whose unsuspecting fondness he found relief, now begin to eye him with suspicion and his home is consumed around him. And even if outwardly he still prospers, out of his very prosperity the curse of God glares at him with a condemnation he cannot endure.

For though he may baffle the scrutiny of men, he cannot escape the curse which rises in his own conscience and in his own life. This meets him in every room ; he is conscious of it as he transacts business with you ; it is full before his mind as he talks with you by his fireside ; at every turn it stands before him. It is so subtle and impalpable he cannot contend with it ; there is nothing he can preserve from its influence ; like a relentless creditor it exacts the uttermost farthing ; like a fire it passes always to new fuel till all is consumed. It leaves no part of his life in which he can secrete himself and say, I am safe from it here. He sees the whole fabric of his life being destroyed by it and he can do nothing to stay the destruction. There is nothing so substantial as to resist its gnawing tooth. He feels that it is the hand of God he is fallen into, for he recognises that the curse that consumes him is as just and as omnipresent as God Himself. He learns at last that " morality is in the nature of things," and that he who proposes to better himself by fraud is simply proposing to make

a new world and a world very different from this. When we begin to feel the reality and penalty of sin, we naturally attempt to excuse ourselves. We begin to wonder whether after all it may not be a mere superstition to be so afraid of sin, whether we were not intended to live freely in youth and comfortably in age according to our likings. But we find that we might as well resent sleeping as an interruption, and strive to do without it; or think eating a mere traditional custom; nature asserts itself and punishes us quickly. And as certainly, though not always as speedily, does a man receive according to the deeds he has done. He finds that when he breaks a moral law he makes all nature his enemy.

The grand result, then, which these visions point to is a cleansed land. "The Banishment of Wickedness" might be affixed to this chapter as its title. In the most graphic form this grand achievement is here set before us. As we represent in our paintings, or on our public buildings, merchandise, music, poetry, or any of the nationalities of the world, in the female form, so here wickedness represented as a woman, is banished to the land of Shinar, a land fit only for transporting convicts to, a land which represented to the Jewish mind all that was remote, alien, and of bad repute. This, then, is God's purpose. He will banish wickedness. How does this purpose suit our view of the future? Possibly there are other things which we would more gladly see packed up and transported. The claims of Christ and of holiness, in all their inevitable and penetrating omnipresence; the serious responsibilities and far-reaching consequences of life—perhaps some feel that these are their most real burden. Might not some, if they spoke their mind, step forward and say. "Put my debts thus out of sight, and let them disappear into a far land, and you will do me a substantial kindness." Or, "Take my bodily ailments and weaknesses, and give them

as real a dismissal, and you show me a vision worth seeing." Take these things, or, we might even dare to say, these persons with whom we have got entangled, and banish them for ever, and our spirit rises to a new life, emancipated and jubilant. How men daily strive to banish out of sight, to bury under a weighty and immovable cover, things that mar their happiness and make life intolerable. The poor wretch that buries deep the blood-stained knife and clothes that betray him; the man that locks his door and burns to the last letter the tell-tale document; the craven who ships to the Antipodes the partner of his guilt—these are but types of the eagerness which we all display in ridding ourselves of what we conceive to be hostile to our interests. Are we as eager to see the last of wickedness? Would we view its banishment from the land, with something of the feeling with which men saw Napoleon safely put out of the way, and removed beyond the possibility of disturbing the peace of Europe? Surely there are many who would do so; who can form to themselves no brighter picture of the future than that here shown us of wickedness borne away; the stork's wings decreasing in the distance, becoming first like gulls, then like swallows, and finally invisible; and men turning then to breathe freely and congratulate one another that now we had seen the last of wickedness; that henceforth there should be no more of those bitterest of all distresses that come through the hard-heartedness of man to man, through lust of pleasure and lust of gold, through envy and ambition and revenge.

And in point of fact this alone can give men a genuine hopefulness about the future. Suppose our own past life were exempt from wickedness and all that wickedness has brought into it, how different and how much happier would it be. Are we not conscious that were we put back into childhood there is nothing we should more determinedly

aim at, than to keep free from the sins we have fallen into? We have a kind of feeling as if without wickedness life would be flat, insipid and wearisome; that if you take away from life all that we need to do on account of the recklessness and sin of other men, and all the excitement of temptation and pleasure of sin in ourselves, you leave nothing but an emptied husk, out of which all the flavour and nutriment have gone. Our own consciousness about the past shows us how contrary to the truth is any such idea; how it is wickedness that at every point, so far from making life brilliant and stimulating, has emptied life of its strength and sparkle, and has left us but the dead sour lees. We see plainly enough that if wickedness is to continue as dominant in ourselves and in others as it has been, it is a mere pretence at living we can make, and our future is emptied of all solid reality of hope.

Are we then to have no share in this greatest work of cleansing the land? Is it a work we have in view as we come in contact with men in the actual life of this world? Do we seek, let us say quite as much, not to say far more, to purge the actual world of wickedness as to make our own out of it? Does it not strike you as a discreditable style of living, to use men for our own worldly uses and never bring them into contact with anything higher than the world; to use all the common usages of trade, good and bad, for our own ends, and never seek to improve them? Who can improve society but the men who actually compose it? Who can bring bad customs to an end but those whose temptation it is to perpetuate them? Where is this purified society God promises to come from, but out of actual human society? It is our society made better by ourselves. To wait till society regenerates itself, and till everybody will support you in righteous action and in carrying out your higher views, is unreasonable, you being the salt which is to purify society. If society is not regenerated it is because

the individual is not. If we decline to use our influence on that part of society we touch, we, in so far, prevent the possibility of the very thing we profess to be hoping for, the regeneration of society.

It would appear that men live on under the impression that meeting one another, and being mixed up in many transactions here, they must adopt some very questionable ways; but that meeting one another in some other and future life, and being mixed up in far larger and wiser society there, they will find it easy to be loving, self-sacrificing, generous, upright, bent upon the public good rather than their own. The hollowness of such an expectation, the fatuity of such a conception of the future, has been exposed a thousand times:

“No, no; the energy of life may be
Kept on after the grave, but not begun!
And he who flagg'd not in the earthly strife,
From strength to strength advancing—only he,
His soul well-knit, and all his battles won,
Mounts, and that hardly, to eternal life.”

Is not probity as much your duty to-day as it will be this day a hundred years hence? Does not God value purity of life in us now as much as He will value it when it may perchance be easier of attainment?

Still it may be felt that the extrication of social and business customs from all that is corrupt may be spoken about, but when these customs are practically met with it appears impossible to eliminate their wickedness and banish it. Even though we clearly see that if we do not live with clean hands in this world there is no great prospect of our doing so anywhere else, though we clearly see that Christ meant to regenerate society upon earth, yet wickedness seems to be so inextricably mixed up with everything, that it evades our grasp. It is almost impossible for us to measure the guilt which may attach to customs in which

we have been brought up. The fact that they are recognised customs, that intercourse with men and the profits of business almost entirely depend upon them, and such considerations as these, weigh against the apparent fraud that strikes the outsider. But this ephah reminds us that there is a measure for every human transaction, that the precise amount of guilt is ascertainable and ascertained, that each weak connivance with dubious practice, and each bold origination of some new and private path to illegitimate gain, is silently weighed and measured by Him whose eyes are in every place; and that so far from wickedness being inextricable from the ordinary ways and life of men, it can be presented as separable and individual as this woman of the vision, and as if it were merely a partner who had hitherto indeed entered into every concern we have to do with, but with whom partnership may be, and is to be, dissolved. The evils which so darkly blot our social life and customs continue very much from this cause, that we do not resolutely measure the guilt which attaches to the practices we are led into as members of society. We make no resolute effort to judge things for ourselves, and to resist being sucked down to much immorality and sin by the current of our profession or trade.

It is an inspiring work to which this vision summons every man, to share in ridding the land of wickedness. The most abundant satisfaction is enjoyed by the man who brings a clear gain to a number of his fellows, or saves them from much suffering; who leaves behind him something which enters into the life of men, and which permanently helps or strengthens or purifies that life. Great inventions, laws potent for good, decided steps in human progress, are possible only to the few. But to all it is possible definitely to weaken that which lies at the root of all human misery. Is there no grain of wickedness you can cast into the ephah? Is there no rising, resisting,

struggling habit that is resolved to be out upon us again, which we can resolutely thrust down and bury under the heavy leaden mass of God's condemnation? Surely when God shows us such a vision, and discloses to us the purposes in which He finds pleasure, there are some who give a serious, thoughtful response, some who say within themselves, I will, in the light of God's presence, consider my life, whither its general course tends, what good purpose it can accomplish, and what in me is hindering this good purpose.

MARCUS DODS.

THE PROPHECIES OF ST. PAUL.

II.—THE EPISTLES TO THE GALATIANS, CORINTHIANS, AND ROMANS.

WHEN we pass from the Epistles to the Thessalonians to the next group of letters—those to the Galatians, Corinthians and Romans, all four of which were written in the course of a single year, some five years later (A.D. 57-58)—we are at once aware of a great diminution in the allusions to the future. Galatians contains rather more matter than both letters to the Thessalonians, but does not contain a single prediction; and the much longer letter to the Romans, while alluding now and then to what the future was to bring forth, contains no explicit mention of the Second Advent. The first letter to the Corinthians is three times as long as both letters to the Thessalonians, but contains rather less predictive matter. We should not be far wrong if we estimated that these four letters, in about nine times the space, give us about as much eschatological matter as the two letters to the Thessalonians.

The contrast exists in nothing else, however, except the

mere matter of amount. The two groups of letters are thoroughly at one in their teaching as to the future—at one, but not mere repetitions of one another. This group is continually supplying what almost seems to be explanations and extensions of the revelations in Thessalonians, so that it exhibits as great an advance in what is revealed as decrease in the relative amount of space given to revelations. So clear is it that the Apostle's preaching to all heathen communities was in essence the same, and that all grew up to the stature of manhood in Christ through practically the same stages, that we may look upon the Thessalonian letters as if they had been addressed to the infancy of every Church, and treat those at present before us as if they were intended to supplement them. This is probably the true account of the very strong appearance of being supplementary and explanatory to those in the letters to Thessalonica, which the predictions in this group of letters are continually presenting.

In these as in those, the Second Advent is represented primarily and most prominently in the aspect of judgment—as the last judgment. Here, too, the desire for moral perfection is referred constantly to it, as for example in 1 Cor. i. 8 cf. 7, where the actual moment in mind is that of the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ. The mutual glorying of the Apostle and his readers in each other is to be “in the day of our Lord Jesus” (1 Cor. i. 14). This is the day of punishment also: the incestuous man is delivered now unto Satan to be punished in the flesh in order that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord (1 Cor. v. 5); and in exactly similar wise, those who are visited with bodily ills for unworthy partaking of the Lord's Supper, receive this chastening that they may not be condemned with the world (1 Cor. xi. 32). The sanction of the anathema pronounced against all who do not love the Lord is Maranatha—“the Lord cometh!” (1 Cor. xvi. 22).

His coming is indeed so sharply defined as the time of judging, in the mind of Paul, that he advises his readers to "judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come" (1 Cor. iv. 5). The connotation of "the day of the Lord" was to him so entirely judgment, that the word "day" had come to mean judgment to him, and he actually uses it as its synonym, speaking of a "human day," for "human judgment" (1 Cor. iv. 3). Of like import is the representation of the second coming as the great day of revelation of character. Of the builders on the edifice of God's Church it is declared that "each man's work shall be made manifest by 'the day.'" "For the day is revealed in fire, and each man's work, of what sort it is,—the fire itself shall test." "If any man's work abideth, he shall receive reward; if any man's work is burned up, he shall be mulcted, but himself shall be saved, but so as through fire" (1 Cor. iii. 13-15). It is scarcely an extension of this teaching to declare openly that when the Lord comes, He "will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall his praise come to each from God" (1 Cor. iv. 5).

In the light of this it is evident what time the Apostle has in mind when he declares that "all of us must needs be made manifest¹ before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each may receive the things [done] through the body according to what he practised, whether good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10); and which day to him was "the day when God shall judge the secrets of men according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ"—"the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom. ii. 16, 5). Yet, in this last passage it is beyond all question that the Apostle has in mind the final judgment, when God "will render to every man according to his works," and the two verses which have been adduced are respectively the

¹ φανερωθῆναι, cf. φανερόν, 1 Cor. iii. 13; φανερώσει, 1 Cor. iv. 5.

opening and closing verse of the splendid passage in which Paul gives us his fullest description of the nature and standards of the awful trial to which all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether those who have law or those who have no law, are summoned "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men according to my gospel through Christ Jesus." Elsewhere in Romans, where judgment necessarily holds an important place in the general argument, the wrath of God is kept hanging over ungodliness and unrighteousness (i. 18; iii. 5; v. 9) and the coming judgment is held before the eyes of the reader (iii. 6; xiv. 10).

For the realization of such a judgment scene (Rom. ii. 5-16; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 10), a resurrection is presupposed, and the reference of the Apostle is obvious when he expresses his confidence that "He who raised up Jesus shall raise up us also with Jesus, and shall present us with you" (2 Cor. iv. 14; cf. v. 10; also 1 Cor. vi. 14). In this compressed sentence, there is pointed out the relation of our resurrection both to the judgment (*παράσχησει*, cf. Col. i. 22) as preceding and in order to it, and to the resurrection of Christ (*σὺν Ἰησοῦ*, cf. the use of *συνεγείρω* in Col. ii. 12; iii. 1) as included in it as a necessary result and part of it. The latter matter is made very plain by the remarkably simple way in which Jesus is declared in Rom. i. 4 to have been marked out as the Son of God "by the resurrection of the dead"—a phrase which has no meaning except on the presupposition that the raising of Jesus was the beginning of the resurrection of the dead and part and parcel of it (cf. also Rom. vi. 6; viii. 11, etc.).

At this point our attention is claimed by that magnificent combined argument and revelation contained in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, which has been the instruction and consolation of the saints through all Christian ages. The occasion which called it forth was singularly like and

singularly unlike that which gave rise to the parallel revelation in 1 Thessalonians. As in the one Church so in the other, there were those who failed to grasp the great truth of the Resurrection, and laid their dead away without hope of their rising again. But in Thessalonica this was due to sorrowing ignorance; in Corinth, to philosophizing pride of intellect. And in the one case, the Apostle meets it with loving instruction; in the other, with a brilliant refutation which confounds opposition, and which, although carrying a tender purpose buried in its bosom, as all the world has felt, yet flashes with argument and even here and there burns with sarcasm. The Corinthian errorists appear to have been spiritualistic philosophizers, perhaps of the Platonic school, who, convinced of the immortality of the soul, thought of the future life as a spiritual one in which men attained perfection apart from, perhaps largely because separate from, the body. They looked for and desired no resurrection; and their formula, perhaps somewhat scoffingly and certainly somewhat magisterially pronounced, was: "There is no rising again of dead men." It is instructive to observe how the Apostle meets their assertion. They did not deny the resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 2, 11)—probably explaining it as a miracle like the reanimation of Lazarus. Yet the Apostle begins by laying firm the proofs of Christ's resurrection (xv. 1-11), and doing this in such a way as to suggest that they needed primary instruction. He "makes known to them," rather than reminds them of the Gospel which he and all the Apostles preached and all Christians believed. With this opening sarcasm, he closes the way of retreat through a denial of the resurrection of Christ, and then presses as his sole argument the admitted fact that Christ had risen. How could they deny that dead men rise, when Christ, who was a dead man, had risen? If there is no resurrection of dead men, then not even is Christ risen. It is plain that their whole position rested on the

assertion of the impossibility of resurrection ; to which it was a conclusive reply that they confessed it in one case. Having uncovered their logical inconsistency, Paul leaves at once the question of fact and presses at length the hideous corollaries that flow from their denial of the possibility of dead men rising, through its involved denial that Jesus, the dead man, had risen—aiming, no doubt, at arousing a revulsion against a doctrine fruitful of such consequences (xv. 14-34).

Having thus moved his readers to shame, he proceeds to meet squarely their real objection to the resurrection, by a full explanation of the nature of the resurrection-body (xv. 35-50), to which he adjoins a revelation concerning the occurrences of the last day (xv. 51-58). To each of these we should give a moment's attention.

The intimate connexion of our resurrection with that of Christ, which we have seen Paul everywhere insisting upon, would justify the inference that the nature of our resurrection-bodies was revealed to men in His resurrection-body, that was seen and handled of men for forty days. This is necessarily implied in the assumption that underlies the argument at 1 Cor. xv. 12 *sq.*, and is almost openly declared at verse 49 ; 2 Cor. iv. 14 ; Rom. viii. 11. In our present passage, however, the Apostle reserves this for the last, and begins by setting forth from natural analogies the possibility of a body being truly one's own body and yet differing largely from that which has hitherto been borne. This is an assertion of sameness and difference. At verse 42 he proceeds to explain the differences in detail. As the change in the form of expression advises us, the enumeration divides itself into two parts at the end of verse 43—the former portion describing in threefold contrast, the physical, and the latter in a single pregnant phrase the moral difference. On the one hand the new bodies that God will give us will no longer be liable to corruption, dishonour or

weakness. On the other, they will no longer be under the power of the only partially sanctified human nature, but rather will be wholly informed, determined and led by the Holy Ghost (verse 44). That this is the meaning of the much disputed phrase: "It is sown a natural (psychic) body it is raised a spiritual (pneumatic) body," is demonstrable from the usage of the words employed. It is plain matter of fact that "psychic" in the New Testament naturally means and is uniformly used to express "self-led" in contrast to "God-led," and therefore, unconverted or unsanctified; while "pneumatic" never sinks in the New Testament so low in its connotation as the human spirit, but always (with the single exception of Eph. vi. 12, where superhuman evil spirits are in mind) refers to "Spirit" in its highest sense,—the Holy Ghost.¹ In this compressed phrase, thus, the Apostle declares that in this life believers do not attain to complete sanctification (Rom. vii. 14–viii. 11), but groan in spirit awaiting the redemption of the body (Rom. viii. 23, vii. 24); while in the heavenly life even their bodies will no longer retain remainders of sin, but will be framed by (Rom. viii. 11), filled with, and led by the Holy Ghost. The incomparable importance of this moral distinction over the merely physical ones is illustrated by the Apostle's leaving them to devote the next five verses to

¹ This is gradually becoming recognised by the best expositors. Compare the satisfactory article on *πνευματικός* in the third edition of Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek*, with the very unsatisfactory one in the second edition. He now tells us that the word is used "in profane Greek only in a physical or physiological sense, commonly the former;—in biblical Greek only in a religious, that is religio- or soteriologico-psychological sense=belonging to the Holy Ghost or determined by the Holy Ghost," p. 675, cf. p. 676. (The reader needs to be warned that he will find no hint of Cremer's entire rewriting of this article, in the *Supplement* to their edition of Cremer's Lexicon issued by T. & T. Clark this year.) So Meyer's latest view (to which he did not correct the Commentary throughout) is given in his *Com. on 1 Cor.*, E. T., p. 298, note: "*Πνευματικός* is nowhere in the New Testament the opposite of *material*, but of *natural* (1 Pet. ii. 5 not excluded); and the *πνεῦμα* to which *πνευματικός* refers is always (except Eph. vi. 12, where it is the *diabolical* spirit-world that is spoken of) the *Divine πνεῦμα*." The italics are his own.

the justification of this, closing (verse 50) with a chiasmic recapitulation in which he pointedly puts the moral difference first : " Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." For, that " flesh and blood " must here be understood ethically and not physically is already evident from the preceding context and is put beyond question by the settled ethical sense of the phrase—which is, of course, used in the New Testament also only in its established ethical sense, and could not be used otherwise without misleading the reader. All crass inferences that have been drawn from it, therefore, in a physical sense are illegitimate to start with, and are negatived to end with by the analogy of Christ's resurrection-body, which we have seen Paul to understand to be a case under the rule, and which certainly had flesh and bones (Luke xxiv. 39). Paul does not deny to our resurrection body, therefore, materiality, which would be a *contradictio in adjecto* ; he does not deny " flesh " to it,—which he hints, rather, will be its material, though of " another " kind than we are used to (verse 39) ; he denies to it " fleshlyness " in any, even the smallest degree, and weakness of any and every sort. In a word, he leaves it human but makes it perfect.

After so full an explanation of the nature of the resurrection body, it was inevitable that deeper questions should arise concerning the fate of those found by the advent still clothed in their bodies of humiliation. Hence a further revelation was necessary beyond what had been given to the Thessalonians, and the Apostle adds to that, that those found living shall be the subjects of an instantaneous change which will make them fit companions for the perfected saints that have slept. For when the trumpet sounds and the dead are raised incorruptible, they too in the twinkling of an eye shall be " changed." And the change is for them as for the dead a putting on of incorruption

and of immortality. The spectacle of these multitudes, untouched by death, receiving their perfect and immortal bodies is the great pageant of the conquest of death, and the Apostle on witnessing it in spirit cannot restrain his shout of victory over that whilom enemy of the race, whose victory is now reversed and the sinews of whose fatal sting wherewith it had been wont to slay men are now cut. So complete is Christ's conquest that it looses its hold over its former victims and the men still living cannot die. The rapidity of action on "the great day" is also worth notice. The last trump sounds—the dead spring forth from the grave—the living in the twinkling of an eye are changed—and all together are caught up into the air to His meeting,—or ever the rushing train of angels that surround their Lord and ours can reach the confines of the earth. Truly events stay not, when the Lord comes.

Important as these revelations are, they become almost secondary when compared with the contents of that wonderful passage 1 Cor. xv. 20-28, the exceeding richness of which is partially accounted for by the occasion of its utterance. It comes in the midst of Paul's effort to move his readers by painting the terrible consequences of denial of the possibility of resurrection, involving denial of the fact that Christ has risen. He feels the revulsion he would beget in them, and relieves his overburdened heart by suddenly turning to rest a moment on the certainty of Christ's rising, and to sweep his eye over all the future, noting the effects of that precious fact up to the end. He begins by reasserting the inclusion of our resurrection in that of Christ, who was but the first-fruits of those asleep, and then justifies it by an appeal to the parallel of Adam's work of destruction, declaring, apparently, that as physical death came upon all men through Adam's sin, so all men shall be rescued from its bondage by Christ's work of redemption. The context apparently confines the word

“death” in these verses to its simple physical sense, while on the contrary the “all” of both clauses seems unlimited, and the context appears to furnish nothing to narrow its meaning to a class. They thus assert the resurrection of all men without distinction as dependent on and the result of Christ’s work, just as all men, even the redeemed, taste of death as the result of Adam’s sin. “But” the Apostle adds, returning to the Christian dead, “this resurrection though certain, is not immediate; each rises in his own place in the ranks—Christ is the first-fruits, then His own rise at His coming; then is the end” (verses 23, 24). The interminable debates that have played around the meaning of this statement are the outgrowth of strange misconceptions. Because the resurrection of the wicked is not mentioned it does not at all follow that it is excluded; the whole section has nothing to do with the resurrection of the wicked (which is only incidentally included and not openly stated in the semi-parenthetic explanations of verses 21 and 22), but, like the parallel passage in 1 Thessalonians, confines itself to the Christian dead. Nor is it exegetically possible to read the resurrection of the wicked into the passage as a third event to take place at a different time from that of the good, as if the Apostle had said: “Each shall rise in his own order; Christ the first-fruits,—then Christ’s dead at His coming,—then, the end of the resurrection, namely of the wicked.” The term “the end,” is a perfectly definite one with a set and distinct meaning, and from Matthew (*e.g.* xxiv. 6, cf. 14) throughout the New Testament, and in these very epistles (1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 13, 14), is the standing designation of the “end of the ages,” or the “end of the world.” It is illegitimate to press it into any other groove here. Relief is not however got by varying the third term, so as to make it say that “then comes the end, accompanied by the resurrection of the wicked,” for this is importing into the passage what

there is absolutely nothing in it to suggest. The word *τάγμα* does not in the least imply succession; but means "order" only in the sense of that word in such phrases as "orders of society." Neither does the "they that are Christ's" prepare the mind to expect a statement as to "those who are not Christ's," any more than in Rom. ix. 6, when we hear of "Israel," and "those of Israel," we expect immediately to hear of "those not of Israel." The contrast is entirely absorbed by the "Christ" of the preceding clause, and only the clumsiness of our English gives a different impression. Not only, however, is there no exegetical basis for this exposition in this passage; the whole theory of a resurrection of the wicked at a later time than the resurrection of the just is excluded by this passage. Briefly, this follows from the statement that after the coming of Christ, "then comes the end" (verse 24). No doubt the mere word "then" (*εἰτα*) does not assert immediateness, and for ought necessarily said in it, "the end" might be only the next event mentioned by the Apostle, although the intervening interval should be vast and crowded with important events. But the context here necessarily limits *this* "then" to immediate subsequence.

Exegetically this follows, indeed, from the relation of verse 28 to 23 *b*, for the long delay asserted in which it assigns the reason: Christ's children rise not with Him, because death is the last enemy to be conquered by Him, and their release from death cannot, therefore, come until all His conquests are completed. The matter can be reduced, however, to the stringency of a syllogism. "The end" is declared to take place "whenever Christ giveth over (the immediateness is asserted by the present) the kingdom to God;" and this occurs "whenever He shall have conquered" all His enemies, the last of which to be conquered is death (verse 26). Shortly, then, the end comes so soon as death is conquered. But death is already

conquered when it is forced to loose its hold on Christ's children; and that is at the Parousia (ver. 23). If any should think to escape this, as if it were an inference, it would be worth while to glance at verse 54, where it is, as we have seen, asserted that the victory over death is complete and his sting destroyed at the Second Advent, and that the rising of Christ's dead is a result of this completed conquest. The end then is synchronous with the victory over death, which itself is synchronous with the second coming, and if the wicked rise at all (which verses 21, 22 assert), it is all one whether we say they rise at the Advent or at the end, since these two are but two names for the same event. Of this, indeed, Paul's language elsewhere should have convinced us: "who shall also confirm you unto the end, unaccusable in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 7), "I hope ye will acknowledge unto the end, . . . that we are your glorying even as ye are also ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus" (2 Cor. i. 14). So then, the Second Advent is represented to be itself "THE END."

With the emergence of this fact, the importance of our present passage is revealed. It is immediately seen to open to us the nature of the whole dispensation in which we are living, and which stretches from the First to the Second Advent, as a period of advancing conquest on the part of Christ. During its course He is to conquer "every rulership and every authority and power" (verse 24), and "to place all His enemies under His feet" (verse 25), and it ends when His conquests complete themselves by the subjugation of the "last enemy," death. We purposely say, period of "conquest," rather than of "conflict," for the essence of Paul's representation is not that Christ is striving against evil, but progressively (*ἑσχατος*, verse 26) overcoming evil, throughout this period. A precious passage in the Epistle to the Romans (xi. 25 *sq.*, cf. verse

15) draws the veil aside to gladden our eyes with a nearer view of some of these victories ; telling us that “ the fulness of the Gentiles shall be brought into ” the Church, and after that “ all Israel shall be saved,” and by their salvation great blessings,—such a spiritual awakening as can only be compared to “ life from the dead ”—shall be brought to all God’s people. There may be some doubt as to the exact meaning of these phrases. The “ fulness of the Gentiles,” however, in accordance with the usual sense of the genitive with “ *pleroma*,” and the almost compulsion of the context, should mean, not the Gentile contingent to the elect, but the whole body of the Gentiles.¹ And “ Israel ” almost certainly means not the true but the fleshly “ Israel.” In this case, the prophesy promises the universal Christianization of the world,—at least the nominal conversion of all the Gentiles and the real salvation of all the Jews. In any understanding of it, it promises the widest practicable extension of Christianity, and reveals to us Christ going forth to victory. But in this, which seems to us the true understanding, it gives us a glimpse of the completion of His conquest over spiritual wickedness, and allows us to

¹ The exegetical question really turns on the sense to be given to Ἰσραὴλ in xi. 26. If τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν in verse 25, means “ those of the Gentiles who go towards filling up the kingdom,” then πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ of verse 26, must of necessity be the spiritual Israel, distinguished from Ἰσραὴλ of verse 25, by the inclusive πᾶς. Then the sense would be that “ hardening has befallen Israel ” temporarily—viz. until the Gentile contingent comes in,—and thus (“ in this way,” the most natural sense of οὕτως), ALL Israel shall be saved ;—not part only, but all. So that the passage continues to justify the temporary rejection of Israel by its gracious purpose, viz. that thus the Gentiles receive their calling, and all God’s children, out of every nation, are saved. On the other hand if, as is most natural and usual, τῶν ἐθνῶν is genitive of what is filled up, so that the phrase means, the whole body of the Gentiles, then there is no thought to carry over from it to condition πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ in verse 26, and it naturally follows in sense the Ἰσραὴλ of verse 25. The sense then is that which is suggested in the text. That Ἰσραὴλ of verse 26 is the fleshly Israel seems to follow from the succeeding context, as well as from the difficulty of taking the words in two different senses in so narrow a context. But if so, this carries the meaning of the “ fulness of the Gentiles ” with it, and the interpretation given in the text is the only admissible one.

see in the spirit the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth even as it is in heaven." It is natural to think that such a victory cannot be wrought until the end is hastening—that with its completion nothing will remain to be conquered but death itself. But the Apostle does not tell us this,¹ and we know not from him how long the converted earth is to await its coming Lord.

An even more important fact faces us in the wonderful revelation we have been considering (1 Cor. xv. 20–28): the period between the two advents is the period of Christ's kingdom, and when He comes again it is not to institute His kingdom, but to lay it down (verses 24, 28). The completion of His conquest, which is marked by conquering "the last enemy," death (verse 28), which in turn is manifest when the just arise and Christ comes (verses 54, 23), marks also the end of His reign (verse 25) and the delivery of the kingdom to God, even the Father (verse 24). This is indubitably Paul's assertion here, and it is in perfect harmony with the uniform representation of the New Testament, which everywhere places Christ's kingdom before and God's after the Second Advent. The contrast in Matt. xiii. 41 and 43 is not accidental. We cannot enter into the many deep questions that press for discussion when this ineffable prediction is even approached. Suffice it to say that when we are told that Jesus holds the kingship for a purpose (verse 25), namely the completion of His mediatorial work, and that when it is accomplished He will restore it to Him who gave it to Him (verse 28), and thus the Father will again become "all relations among all creations,"—nothing is in the remotest way suggested inconsistent with the co-equal Deity of the Son with the Father and His eternal co-regnancy with Him over the universe. Manifestly we

¹ I shall not deny that the *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* of ver. 15 may mean the general resurrection, but it is an unexampled phrase for this conception and cannot be asserted to mean it. Nor in this context is it natural to so understand it.

must distinguish between the mediatorial kingship which Jesus exercises by appointment of His Father, and the eternal kingship which is His by virtue of His nature, and which is one with God's own.

As to the duration of Christ's kingdom—or in other words the length of time that was to elapse before the Lord came—Paul says nothing in this passage. Nor does he anywhere in these Epistles speak more certainly about it than in those to the Thessalonians (1 Cor. i. 7; xi. 26). He so expresses himself as to leave the possibility open that the Lord might come in his own time (1 Cor. xv. 51); but he makes it a matter for experience to decide whether He will or not (2 Cor. v. 1, *εἴαν* with the subjunctive, cf. verse 3 *sq.*). It is only through misunderstanding that passages have been adduced as asserting a brief life for the world. When (1 Cor. x. 11) the “ends of the ages” are said to have already come, a technical term is used which declares that after this present inter-adventual period there remains no further earthly dispensation, but nothing is implied as to the duration of these “last times” (*acharith hayyamim*). So, when (1 Cor. vii. 25–29) the Corinthians are advised to refrain from earthly entanglements because of “the impending distress,” which should shortly tear asunder every human tie, there is nothing to show that the Apostle had the Second Advent in mind, and everything in the Neronian persecution and the wars of succession and the succeeding trials to Christians to fully satisfy the prediction.¹ The very difficult passage at Rom. xiii. 11–14 appears also to have been misapplied to the advent by the modern exegesis. Its obvious parallels are Eph. v. 1–14

¹ The reference of the phrase, “for the fashion of this world passeth away” (verse 31) is not to the broad but the narrow context, justifying the immediately preceding statement, that those who use the world should be as those not using it. It is but equivalent to the line, “This world is all a fleeting show,” and is parallel to 1 John ii. 17. Although it may have some reference to the Second Advent, as the day of renovation, it does not affect verses 20 and 29.

and 1 Thess. v. 1-11. The whole gist of the passage turns on moral awaking; and the word "salvation" appears to refer to the consummation of salvation in a subjective rather than objective sense (Rom. x. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 13); while the aorist, "when we believed," seems not easily to lend itself to furnishing a *terminus a quo* for the calculation of time, but rather to express the act by which their salvation was brought closer. So that the meaning of the passage would seem to be: "Fulfil the law of love, I say. I appeal to you for renewed efforts by your knowledge of the time: that it is high time for you at length to awake out of sleep. Long ago when you believed, you professed to have come out of darkness into light, and to have shaken yourselves free from the inertia as well as deeds of the night. Now salvation is closer to us than it was when we made that step. Having begun, we have advanced somewhat towards the goal. The night of sin in which the call for repentance found us is passing away. Let us take off at length our night-clothes, and buckle on the armour for the good fight—yea, let us rid ourselves of all that belongs to the night, and put on the Lord Jesus Himself." If this understanding is correct, the Apostle does not count the days and assert that the time that had elapsed since his conversion had nearly run the sands of all time out, but rather appeals to his readers to renew their strenuous and hearty working out of their salvation by the encouragement that they had already progressed somewhat on the road, and could more easily and hopefully take a second step.

There remain two very interesting passages (1 Cor. v. 1-10; Rom. viii. 18-25) which give us an insight as no others do into the Apostle's personal feelings towards this life, death, and the Advent. Nowhere else are the trials under which he suffered life so clearly revealed to us as in the opening chapters of 2 Corinthians. Amid them all, the

very allusions to which, lightly touched as they are, appal us, the Apostle is upheld by the greatness of his ministry and the greatness of his hope. Though his outward man is worn away—what then? He need not faint, for his inward man is renewed day by day, and this affliction is light compared with the eternal weight of glory in store for him. He longs for the rest of the future life (cf. also Rom. vii. 25); but he shrinks from death. He could desire rather to be alive when the Lord comes, and that he might put on “the house from God, the dwelling not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,” over this “earthly tent-dwelling” which he now inhabits. He only desires—does not expect this; he does not at all know whether he shall be found not naked when the putting-on time comes. But he longs for relief from the burdens of life, that somehow this mortality may be swallowed up of life. And when he bethinks him that to be at home in the body is to be abroad from the Lord, the other world is so glorious to him that he is not only willing but even desires (“rather,” verse 8) to enter it even “naked”—he is well pleased to go abroad from the body and go home to the Lord. Like Bunyan and the sweet singer, Paul, looking beyond the confines of earth, can only say, “Would God that I were there!” This longing for relief from earthly life is repeated in Romans (vii. 25), and the groaning expectation of the consummation as the swallowing up of corruption in incorruption is attributed in the wonderful words of Romans viii. 18 *sq.* to the whole of the lower creation. All nature, says Paul, travails in the same longing. And the consummation brings not only relief to Christ’s children, who have received the firstfruits of the Spirit, in the redemption of the body, but also deliverance and renovation to all nature as well. This noble conception was implied already in the teaching of the Old Testament, not only in its declaration that the world was cursed for man’s sake (Rom. viii. 20), but in the pre-

diction of a new heavens and a new earth (verse 21). Paul here simply takes his position in the company of the prophets.

The glories of the future world find comparative expression again in 1 Cor. xiii. 10-13 as not only spiritual but eternal and perfect. There are besides two rapid allusions to future glories which are so slightly touched on in contexts of stinging satire as not fully to explain themselves. The one reminds the saints that they shall judge the world and angels (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3), and the other assumes that at some time or other, they are to come to a kingship (1 Cor. iv. 8). Out of our present epistles alone the time and circumstances when these promises shall be fulfilled can scarcely be confidently asserted. We can only say that if the reigning of the saints refers to a co-reigning with Christ (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12), it must be fulfilled before Christ lays down His kingdom. And in like manner the judging must come before the Advent, unless it refers only to the part the saints take in the last judgment scene (cf. Matt. xix. 28; xxv. 31). The Apostle expects his readers to understand his allusions out of knowledge obtained elsewhere than in these epistles. Perhaps he has in mind such "words of the Lord" as are recorded in Luke xxii. 29, 30. For us, the whole matter may rest for the present *sub judice*.

Allegheny.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THOUGHTS.

Light.—When we say, this or that enlightens ignorance or throws light upon what is obscure and perplexing, do we realise what is necessarily and invariably the Manifesting Power? *God is Light.*

If we really believe this, let us strive thoroughly to grasp the nature of physical light and whence it comes, what it can

do for us and how it acts, and then let us apply its revealing power in analogy and as parable. Let us learn that "mystery" in the sense of what "mystifies" and baffles, what seems a mere inscrutable puzzle to us, is exactly what God is revealed as Light in order to make clear; that in Him is no darkness at all on any subject, only in us because we will not go to Him in faith for shining rays to cast upon it, or because abiding in contented darkness has made our eyes too weak at first to bear them. "Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, and not to be put on the stand? For there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was anything made secret, but that it should come to light. "If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear" (St. Mark iv. 21-24). What then is light? Emphatically that by which we see *whatever* we perceive, whatever is evident to us, that by which we discover and discern, behold or contemplate. Yet many of us practically deny that we can only see by God; and even speak of Him in the terms of shadow, thinking thus to reverence Him.

As God is Light, and the very Father of lights (St. Jas. i. 17), and in Him we live and move and have our being, does it not follow that every intelligible question implies an intelligible answer, and that we are intended *not* to rest content until we find it?

If we were incapable of receiving an answer, we should be incapable of conceiving the corresponding question. Each seeking "Why?" is put into our hearts by the very Light whereby we are at last to learn the answer. Thus indeed He saith unto us with warning voice, "Take heed what ye hear; with what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you; and more shall be given unto you. For he that hath to him shall be given; and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath" (St. Mark iv. 24, 25).

Our measures of what Light can do for us, morally, intellectually, spiritually, are too often poor and contracted; and thus the advancing growth of men's awakening faculties, the increasing area of scientific, historical and general knowledge, tends to deprive us of what little light we have; we tremble and we dare not look God's own facts in the face; we shiver in a darkness mis-called faith. Yet even what we are not able yet to see, we may sometimes, if we will use God's gifts, *infer*. "Uranus" first and

"Neptune" next were discovered not directly but by inference. Thus may not integral parts of the spiritual "system" of which the Sun of our being is the centre, be but waiting for discernment on the field of revelation by inference? Whole worlds of truth are hidden in the depths of the Living Word, ready for the patient and faithful enquirer, who uses fearlessly because trustfully and honestly the instruments which God Himself has given him and as Light shall enable him to apply. Again, as Light also He is our Father.

We too, in virtue of our childship, *in the name of the Son*, must be whatever light as well as whatever heat is; "a burning and a shining lamp" shall each one be, in whom is stored up the beams of the Sun of all Suns, to flash forth at the kindling touch of the Holy Spirit, to radiate truth and shrivel falsehood everywhere.

V. W. G.

BREVIA.

Galatians iii. 20.—I desire to be allowed briefly to supplement the admirable *précis* of the argument of the Epistle to the Galatians, so clearly traced by Professor Godet in the April number of the *EXPOSITOR* for 1885, with a note on the much contested passage, Galatians iii. 20. None of the manifold interpretations hitherto proposed of this passage (reckoned by Dr. Jowett 420), has succeeded in gaining general assent. The cause of the failure would seem to be the mistaken rendering of *ὁ μεσίτης* by "a mediator," in the generic sense of any, or every mediator, instead of "*the* mediator," in the special case of "the law" which had just been mentioned (ver. 19), namely Moses.

The translation "*a* mediator,"¹ which seems now to pass

¹ Even in a grammatical point of view, the propriety of the present rendering is very questionable. If St. Paul meant to predicate something respecting *a* mediator in the generic sense, why should he render his meaning ambiguous by inserting the article when (especially as following close upon *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίων*) the natural and unequivocal expression would be *μεσίτης δέ*, without the article? Such is the usual practice in the case of resumption of a term used in the preceding sentence or clause; e.g. *ἀμαρτία δέ*, Rom. v. 13; *διαθήκη γάρ*, Heb. ix. 17; and even where the article has immediately preceded, as, *ἐλπίς δέ*, Rom. viii. 24, though preceded by *τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι*; *ἀμαρτία γάρ*, Rom. vi. 14, though referring to *τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ* in ver. 13. No example of the opposite usage has yet been cited.

unquestioned on all hands is, we submit, entirely subversive of the Apostle's argument. The proposition with which he starts is, that God had made a covenant with Abraham in which *all nations* of the earth were interested (ver. 8), so that "on the *Gentiles* might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus" (ver. 14). This "covenant, which was confirmed before of God, the law which was given four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect" (ver. 17). Consequently the law was a mere interpolated dispensation, appointed for a temporary purpose, and which must disappear as soon as the time of the fulfilment of God's "promise" and previous "covenant" (for both terms are applied to the blessings of Abraham, see verses 14 and 15) had arrived. The implied answer of the Jew to this objection evidently is that the law was the fulfilment of this "promise" (*a*), and "covenant" (*b*), and therefore was of permanent and universal obligation; circumcision and observance of all the ordinances of the law being the indispensable means of admittance for strangers to the privileges of the Jew. To each of these pleas the Apostle replies.

To the first (*a*), regarding God's words to Abraham as a "promise," he replies in ver. 18, that law and promise are, in one respect, directly opposed. Law requires obedience to its injunctions—a condition in the case of God's moral law impossible of performance; whereas the promise is gratuitous, and unfettered by conditions other than the simple acceptance by faith.

As to the second (*b*), regarding God's words to Abraham as a "covenant," in reply to what the Jew would object, "Wherefore then serveth the law?" (ver. 19), St. Paul answers: The law, as a covenant with the Jewish people, had a very important function to perform—to convince men of "transgressions," and the awful power of sin, and so prepare for the acceptance of the promised salvation when it came; but he concedes in part to the Jew his plea (ver. 19, latter clause). True, the law has some of the characteristics which might seem to point it out as the fulfilment of the covenant with Abraham. It is a covenant inaugurated with great solemnity, "through angels, and by the hand of a mediator." To this plea St. Paul's reply is *ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐπὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἑαυτὴν*. "But *the* mediator [in the case of the law] is not [a mediator] of ONE ["seed," including "all nations"], but God is ONE," which reminds us of the analogous expression in the kindred

Epistle to the Romans, iii. 30, *εἴπερ εἰς ὁ Θεός*, "if so be that God is ONE," of Jew and Gentile. If this reply, as is generally assumed, depends on "the *generic* idea of a mediator," that is, on some quality common to every mediator, the gospel is equally excluded with the law from being the fulfilment of God's covenant with Abraham.

It would indeed be "a paradox (as Dr. Jowett remarks) to place the superiority of the gospel over the law, in the fact that the law had a mediator, and the gospel had not"! How reconcile this with St. Paul's statement in 1 Tim. ii. 5, where in treating on the very same subject, *the relation of the Gentiles to the gospel-covenant*, he adduces as an argument for the equal title of *all* men to its blessings, "For there is ONE God, and ONE Mediator between God and men"? We confess our difficulty in accepting any interpretation of the passage in Galatians, which so far from helping us to see the connexion between the two statements makes the one contradictory of the other.

The key, which we believe will be found to unlock all the intricacies of this passage, and which lets in a flood of light on this and many other statements of Holy Writ, is the word "ONE," which meets us at the beginning, the middle, and the close.

Verse 16. "ONE" is the "*seed*" of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, including "*all nations*." "In thee shall *all the nations* be blessed" (ver. 8), was the proposition with which St. Paul started, to prove that "the blessing of Abraham was to come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ" (ver. 14).

Verses 28, 29, at the close evidently revert to the opening statements at the beginning, "Ye are *all* ONE in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

In verse 20, therefore, the ONE-ness in the centre, must, it would appear, refer to the same UNITY. When in the intermediate argument (between the proposition and the conclusion), designed to refute the plea of the Jews (that their covenant was the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham), St. Paul insists on the non-UNITY, or want of ONE-ness connected with a mediator, the presumption is strong that it is to the *Mosaic covenant and its mediator* that he is denying the ONE-ness, which he claims to be fulfilled in the Christian covenant and its mediator.

The steps of the argument will thus be:—

I. Verse 16. ONE is the "seed" of Abraham, to whom the covenanted "blessing" which extends to "all the nations" is promised.

II. Verse 20. The mediator must be a "mediator of ONE" [seed] embracing all, and making all ONE, which Moses is not; but God is ONE," embracing all Jews and Gentiles, "which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith" (cf. Rom. iii. 30).

III. Verses 28, 29. But "ye are all ONE in Christ Jesus," and therefore "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Professor Godet has correctly shown that St. Paul, in the argument which he founds on the singular "seed," not "seeds," being employed in the promises given to Abraham, so far from being ignorant of the collective sense usually attached to the Hebrew term "seed" as denoting posterity, "knows and applies the collective sense" in the case in question. "The opposition which he brings out in the verses before us is not between the Christ as an individual and the multitudes of the Jewish people, but between the *spiritual seed* of faith, which alone is heir to the promises, and other lines of Abraham's descendants of an altogether different character, especially that to which his adversaries referred, the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, *i.e.* the Jewish people as such. God, in making His promise to Abraham, had not contemplated for one moment two seeds different, but both equally legitimate, the one by faith the other by the flesh, two hostile families of justified and saved ones. He had ever contemplated but one seed, the characteristic of which is the ever fresh reproduction of the faith of Abraham, and which is all virtually contained in Christ, who is the Head of which it is the body (chap. iii. 15-18)."

But important as it is to understand the sense in which St. Paul regards the term "seed" in the passage before us (strange to say, still a cause of stumbling to some critics), yet it is not on the higher and spiritual sense of "seed" that the Apostle aims to concentrate the attention of his readers, but on the new and higher signification of the term "ONE" connected with "seed"—of a spiritual ONENESS or UNITY including plurality and in which many might partake—and which was first clearly brought out by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. In the Old Testament the word seems scarcely to have got beyond the idea of a mere numerical unity. "Hear, O

Israel: The Lord our God is *ONE* Lord" (Dent. vi. 4), is a protest against polytheism—that *ONE* only has a right to the title of Godhead, in opposition to the "gods many and lords many" whom the nations around worshipped, and who having forsaken the *ONE* God and Father of all, lost all true sense of their brotherhood and unity, and became estranged both from Him and from each other. To Christ Himself we owe the conception of a higher *UNITY* or *ONE*-ness in which a Plurality can partake. He revealed what is the great stumbling block to the Jew and Unitarian, that the *UNITY* which exists in the Godhead is not a numerical unity, for He ever distinguishes in the most marked manner between Himself and His Father as being two distinct persons (as He does at other times with respect to the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13); yet in the higher sense of unity He declares Himself to be altogether *ONE* with the Father. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing; for what things soever He doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner" (John v. 19). "Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me" (John xiv. 11). "I and the Father are *ONE*" (John x. 30, *ἐν ἑμῷ*). But it is especially in His High-Priestly prayer for His Church, that He brings out with remarkable fulness the spiritual, all-embracing unity that He came to reveal and realize between all the members of His body, and Himself and His Father, "Holy Father, keep them in My name which Thou hast given Me, that they may be *ONE*, even as we are" (John xvii. 11). "The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given unto them; that they may be *ONE*, even as we are *ONE*; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into *ONE*" (ver. 22, 23).

This idea of unity in the higher and spiritual sense was eagerly caught up by the Apostle to the Gentiles, and repeatedly insisted upon in all different forms as characteristic of Christ's mission and work, as concentrating *all* in one; *e.g.* "We who are many are *ONE* bread, *ONE* body; for we *all* partake of the *ONE* bread" (1 Cor. x. 17). "There is *ONE* body, and *ONE* spirit, even as also ye were called in *ONE* hope of your calling; *ONE* Lord, *ONE* faith, *ONE* baptism, *ONE* God and Father of *all*, who is over *all*, and through *all*, and in *all*" (Eph. iv. 4-6). The great purpose for which God sent His Son into the world He represents to be that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in *ONE all* things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which

are on earth" (Eph. i. 10). As there is but ONE God for all, so he considers that there can be but ONE mediator for all. In exhorting that prayers and intercessions be made for all men, he assigns as a reason that God "willeth that all men should be saved"—"For there is ONE God, ONE mediator also between God and men, Himself man" [as well as God, and therefore can mediate perfectly between them] (1 Tim. ii. 4, 5). As God is ONE, universal, *all-embracing*, so must the mediator be ONE, universal, *all-embracing*, a "mediator of ONE" [seed] including all, and not as was Moses. This evidently was the leading idea in the Apostle's mind in Gal. iii. 20. Moses was but a partial mediator. He was not a mediator of a perfectly united body, which it was God's purpose, as indicated beforehand to Abraham, to unite in ONE in Christ, the true universal mediator. Understood in this light the passage in question forms a very relevant step in the Apostle's argument.¹

This idea of an *all-including Unity*, in which many can partake, seems to mould the whole course of the Apostle's argument in Gal. iii. 7-29. This is the view which he takes of the "promises" made to Abraham. Superficially regarded in their literal meaning, the first of the promises, "*In thee* shall all the nations be blessed" (ver. 8), might be held to be sufficiently fulfilled *in Abraham*, as being the progenitor of the Jewish people to whom we owe the transmission of God's Holy Scriptures, and deliverance from the abominations of idolatry, a lesson which it cost them so severe and long-continued chastisements to learn—while the second promise, "*In thy seed* shall all be blessed" might seem little more than a repetition of the first, or be held to be sufficiently fulfilled in Christ's being the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, from whose birth we date the era of a renovated world. But the Apostle teaches us to see a much deeper and more intimate relation as designed by the expression "*in thee*" of the first promise, by explaining it to mean, *In thee* as their spiritual father, *in* whom *all* believers are contained, and *with* whom they must be ONE in faith, shall all be blessed. "So then they which be of faith are blessed *with* faithful Abraham" (ver. 9). A like union *with*, and inclusion *in* Christ, it would seem therefore, he intends us to understand in the second promise, "*In thy seed* shall all the nations bless themselves."² To partake of the blessing,

¹ I use the words of a friend to whom my view was shown.

² For a fuller view of the distinction between the first and second promise, let me refer to an article in vol. viii. second series, p. 200.

they must be *ONE with*, and find their unity *in* *ONE* second Head of Humanity, in whom and in His blessing, all the race can be included, as all were included in the first Adam, and in his curse.

Now Moses, the mediator of the Jewish covenant, is not such a “mediator of *ONE*,” uniting all into *ONE*, making all *ONE* seed, *ONE* body, *ONE* mind and spirit—*ONE* with God, *ONE* with each other.

But Christ is exactly such a mediator. He is the *ONE* seed in whom all find their unity. In Him God and man are made *ONE*, for He is both in *ONE* person. In Him all men and nations, the most diverse, have become *ONE*, being all “by *ONE* spirit baptized into *ONE* body” (1 Cor. xii. 13), according to the good pleasure of Him who purposed “that in the dispensation of the fulness of time, He would gather together in *ONE* all things in Christ” (Eph. i. 10).

Christ, as mediator, is a “mediator of *ONE*” in the fullest sense as making all *ONE*. “God,” the author of the promise, “is *ONE*” God of all, Jews and Gentiles (comp. Rom. iii. 30).

“Ye are all *ONE* in Christ Jesus” (ver. 28), being all “baptized into Christ,” having “put on Christ” (ver. 27). “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (ver. 29).

University of Aberdeen.

JOHN FORBES.

Secret History of St. Paul.—The classical passage (Gal. i. 17) which must always be the touchstone to try all theories of the apostolic age, is a reply to a series of mis-statements and innuendoes which the Galatians had before them and we have not. This is especially important with regard to the strange elliptical verses (ii. 3, 4) on the circumcision of Titus. The Galatians did not need to be told—as do we—whether Titus was circumcised or not. Supposing that he was circumcised—though there ought to have been no need of it—because of false brethren, an author writing for posterity would have been careful to make it clear that he denied the necessity, not the fact, but an author writing for contemporaries who knew the facts as well as he did, might write what might be paraphrased as follows:—

“As for Titus, the story that he had to be circumcised (though I may try now to make out that it was only a temporary concession) is false like the rest, like the insinuation that I learnt

the Gospel from the Twelve, and received my authority to preach from the Church at Antioch. He was only circumcised because of false brethren."

If he was circumcised, why was he circumcised? Because St. Paul had brought him into the Temple? Why should he not? Was not he a brother in Him in whom there was neither Jew nor Gentile, who had made both one and had broken down the middle wall of partition? There could have been no scandal if the brethren had been true to one another. At Jerusalem no outsider could know whether a Nazarene stranger was an Israelite by birth or not. But when false brethren had raised the question, if Titus had once been seen in the court of Israel he had no choice but circumcision, flight or death. His death would not have been martyrdom, his flight would have been a greater victory for the false brethren than his circumcision.

These conjectures claim some support from Acts xvi. 3. Timothy, unlike Titus, was of Hebrew descent. One might think this reason enough that St. Paul should have done spontaneously in his case what in the case of Titus he would not do—or only did after indignant protest; but we are told of another reason. It was notorious that Timothy was uncircumcised; that Titus was uncircumcised could only be ascertained by impertinent curiosity or odious espionage. If St. Paul had chosen an uncircumcised halfbreed, known as such, for his messmate and travelling companion, how could he have become as a Jew to the Jews to gain the Jews? No doubt the Judaisers pressed this concession too against St. Paul; but as there was nothing humiliating in the act itself, St. Luke mentions it in order to explain it.

No doubt also St. Paul's accusers, who brought him at last to martyrdom, harped upon the story that he had profaned the Temple—one of the Roman garrison of Jerusalem had been executed for a profanation of another kind—and even at Rome the charge would be a makeweight. Perhaps for this reason St. Luke, who passes over much that he must have known, is careful to mention that this charge was brought against him—falsely—in the case of Trophimus.

There are other passages in the Acts which seem more intelligible if they were written in view of St. Paul's second trial at Rome. It has often been argued that the particular point at which the Acts close could not have been chosen by an author

writing after the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul; and the only solid reply to this is, that whatever his motives for stopping short of it, the author was acquainted with the martyrdom of St. Paul, since he records the prediction to the elders of Ephesus, that they should see his face no more. If he did return to Asia, as is anticipated in the Epistle to the Colossians and assumed in the Pastoral Epistles, the prediction was falsified. Why was it recorded? His accusers made the most of the fact that all they of Asia were turned away from him—they said he was one who made every place too hot to hold him. What answer could be better than the pathetic scene at Miletus? So also we are told that the conference with the chief of the Jews broke up “after that Paul had spoken one word.” His accusers went about repeating that he had said more and worse; that it was not his guilt if his violence had not provoked a riot. Did they add that he had been acquitted on his appeal by a mistake; that he had passed in a hurry with others, in some general gaol delivery of the Prætorian camp?—is it an answer to this that he dwelt two whole years in his own hired lodging?—that if his accusers had had a case they had plenty of time to urge it against a well-known prisoner?

One can hardly doubt that the hearing of provincial appeals under Nero was a very perfunctory business. That in all probability both the acquittal and the condemnation of the Apostle were practically decided before he came into court. They depended, humanly speaking, upon something like this—whether Theophilus or somebody else could, after many efforts, get the ear for half an hour of some backstairs potentate, who could get the ear of Nero or Tigellinus for five minutes.¹ When St. Paul wrote, “only Luke is with me,” was he writing the Acts? If so, Theophilus was in a position to make the best use of his half hour if he got it.

¹ There were laws under which a Christian who was tried could only be condemned. Those five minutes would settle if St. Paul was to be tried under them. This would depend, not on the evidence of what he had done since his release, for this he could answer for himself; but on the strength of the prejudice that could be kept up in influential quarters about all that had passed before.

On St. Luke ix. 18.—Almost every intelligent reader of the Gospels in the English version must have felt a little startled at the seeming self-contradiction in St. Luke ix. 18, "When He was alone praying, His disciples were with Him." It is true that in the original the contradiction is less direct; the phrase rendered "alone" is *κατὰ μόρας*, which might be glossed "in private" or "in a solitary place"; though the Revisers of 1881 have not thought it worth while to make any material alteration in the old version. And retaining that version, of course the sense is tolerably clear, if we read it without captiousness. The Lord was in private, not with the multitude: perhaps, though "His disciples were with Him," His prayer was still solitary, not shared even by them. But it is worth while to notice that there is a reading, very respectably attested, that would remove the difficulty, such as it is, altogether.

In Westcott and Hort's edition, side by side with the common text CYNHCAN *αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί*, there is given in the margin the reading CYNHNTHCAN *αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.*, which implies (Introduction, § 377), that that reading has, in the judgment of one or both of the Editors, "a reasonable chance of being right." As in the Appendix the passage is not mentioned, we cannot say how much weight was given to internal, how much to documentary evidence, in this favourable judgment of the reading; but the documentary evidence is somewhat stronger than (it may be supposed) the Editors were aware of.

Its main strength is, that it is undoubtedly the reading of the first hand of Cod. B., though an early hand (possibly, Tischendorf thought, the original scribe himself, or if not, the contemporary corrector) replaced it by the received text.¹ Besides this, there is cited for the reading only one not remarkably excellent cursive (245, one of Matthæi's Moscow MSS., from Mount Athos), the Old Latin *f*, and virtually one lectionary (*συνήχθησαν*). But in fact, a fresh collation of Cod. 157—usually considered the second best cursive MS. of the Gospels—shows that this also reads *συνήτησαν*, without any hesitation or ambiguity.

¹ He cancelled the three superfluous letters with dots only: the later hand, who blacked over the letters, did not put his letters exactly over those which he retained; and so the original reading, though plain to a skilled palæographer, is somewhat concealed by the later writing, and had not been observed before Tischendorf. To an unskilled observer it looks not unlike CTNNHNHCAN—a *διπτογραφία* of a type not unusual in Cod. B.

If we adopt this reading, the sense would be transparently clear. The Lord was in the strictest sense “alone praying,” when His “disciples met Him” or “fell in with Him”—came upon the place where He was standing or kneeling in prayer, or perhaps walking like Isaac. Then, His prayer being interrupted by their coming, He asked the question which the Evangelist proceeds to tell us of.

Of course, it does not follow that this clearness of sense proves, or even makes it probable, that the reading is the true one. It is at least as conceivable, that it is an early conjecture—that in the age when the Evangelical text was most of all in a state of flux, some transcriber of the Gospel felt the obvious difficulty of the common text, and saw that three additional letters would remove it. But, while the antiquity of the reading is vouched for by its presence in Cod. B. and the Latin version, it is worth knowing that it was transmitted from early times along more than one line, and along at least one line of high repute for purity.

WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX.

THE FIRST INDICATIONS OF GNOSTICISM IN ASIA MINOR.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

FOUR years had passed away since Tertius, Paul's amanuensis at Corinth, had laid down his pen, after writing, at Paul's dictation, the last words of the Epistle to the Romans. Grave events had taken place in the interval. The Apostle had been arrested in Jerusalem. For two years (59-61) the Roman governor had kept him prisoner in his house at Cæsarea. In order to escape from this captivity, which threatened to be prolonged, the Apostle had been constrained to have recourse to his privilege as a Roman citizen, and to appeal to Cæsar's tribunal. In the autumn of the year 61 he had embarked for Rome with other prisoners and a detachment of the Roman legion. Two faithful friends had accompanied him of their own accord, Aristarchus of Thessalonica and Luke the physician, who had both been his fellow-workers in the latter part of his sojourn in Greece. The story of their escape from shipwreck is well known, and how, after spending the winter in Malta, they arrived in Rome in the spring of 62. Although a prisoner, Paul enjoyed much greater liberty in Rome than at Cæsarea. His military imprisonment was exchanged for what was called *custodia libera*. He was allowed to hire an apartment at his own charge, and he was free to receive there any who wished to visit him. He also maintained constant communication with all the Churches of Greece and of Asia.

In the course of the two years which the Apostle passed in Rome in this position, he one day received a visit from

an evangelist named Epaphras, who had come from Asia Minor, and who had preached Christ with much success in southern Phrygia. There, a few days' journey to the east of Ephesus, in the basin of the Lycus, an affluent of the Meander, is a mountainous region of great beauty. Above it rises Mount Cadmus, massive, picturesque, covered with eternal snows. At its feet runs the Lycus, near which formerly stood the city of Colossæ or Colassæ. A little more to the west were the cities of Laodicea and Hierapolis; all three forming a triangle, of which the last named occupied the northern apex. At the present day the site of the two larger cities, Laodicea and Hierapolis, is only marked by a few ruins, while the vestiges of Colossæ, a league distant from Chonæ (*χῶναι*, the funnel shaped cavities in which the Lycus loses itself at intervals), are still less considerable.

This was the field of labour of the zealous and faithful Epaphras. He had probably been one of Paul's converts during his stay in Ephesus. For, whatever may be said, it is certain that Paul had never himself been in this region (Col. ii. 1). When, at the commencement of his third missionary voyage, he had gone from Antioch into Galatia and from Galatia to Ephesus, he had passed through northern Phrygia, but the basin of the Lycus lay on his left.

It must have been about the same time that Epaphras arrived in Rome that a great earthquake occurred in this district, and was felt with peculiar violence in the city of Laodicea. The exact year in which this catastrophe occurred is not known. Tacitus places it in 60-61; Eusebius in 64; according to Orosius it was still later, in 68. As the Apostle makes no allusion to it, we must conclude either that it did not take place till after the arrival of Epaphras in Rome and the writing of the Epistle to the Colossians, or that Colossæ did not materially suffer, and rapidly re-

covered from the shock. Laodicea rose again from its ruins in the very year of its overthrow (*eodem anno*), and that by its own exertions (*propriis opibus*), as Tacitus tells us.

What we have just said rests upon the supposition that it was in Rome and about the year 62-63 that Epaphras came to visit the Apostle, with what special object we shall have to enquire presently. But many scholars place this visit of Epaphras to Paul at a much earlier date, namely during the captivity of Paul at Cæsarea, from the summer of 59 to the autumn of 61.

The reasons alleged in favour of this opinion are some of them very weak and some simply absurd, and cannot, as it seems to us, weigh at all against those which can be urged in favour of the view we have taken. We call attention, in the first place, to the marked correspondence of style, thought and circumstance between the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Philippians, in which the Apostle frequently alludes to his state of captivity. Timothy, of whom there is no mention during the captivity at Cæsarea, has a share in both these epistles. The reference which Paul makes (Col. iv. 11) to his fellow-workers of Jewish origin, corresponds with what he says to the Philippians on this subject (chap. i. 15-17). Now it is quite certain that the Epistle to the Philippians was written from Rome and not from Cæsarea. For the Apostle says in it that he hopes soon to visit Macedonia, while during his captivity in Cæsarea he had no thought, either before or after his appeal to the emperor, of going anywhere but to Rome and the West.

His whole position, as implied in the Epistles to the Colossians and the Philippians, is one of much greater freedom than was permitted by the more severe form of imprisonment at Cæsarea. There he was chained by the wrist (Acts xxvi. 29), and was only allowed to receive

his relations or friends. Under these circumstances, instead of asking the Churches to pray for him that he might be able faithfully to preach the Gospel, as he does in writing to the Colossians, he would have been more likely to ask them to seek first that he might be set at liberty. In Rome, he was simply guarded by a soldier, and free access was allowed to all who liked to visit him. Thus he was able to discuss for a whole day with the elders of the Jewish synagogue. Now this position of Paul which is described towards the close of the Book of Acts, corresponds exactly with that which we gather from the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Philippians. It could only be in the world's capital that Paul could write thus: "The word of the truth of the gospel which is come unto you, even as it is also in all the world, bearing fruit and increasing as it doth in you also" (i. 6). We know from these epistles that Paul's apartment in Rome was what his prison-cell in Cæsarea never could have been, the head-quarters of the army of evangelists who were going forth under his directions to the conquest of the Gentile world.

But to return to Epaphras. For what purpose did he come to Rome? Did he simply wish to testify to Paul the love and concern of the Churches of Phrygia for the Apostle whom they had never seen in the flesh, but whom they loved in the spirit? Undoubtedly this was part of his mission, and it brought comfort to the heart of Paul (i. 8; ii. 1). But there were more urgent reasons for his undertaking so great a journey. The Churches which Epaphras had founded were troubled at this time by a doctrine which shook the very foundations of the Apostle's teaching as they had received it through Epaphras; and if this new school were to prevail, it would not fail to affect deeply the religious and moral life awakened in these young Churches. In order to understand the greatness

of the danger which had led Epaphras to seek counsel of the Apostle, we must call to mind the particular circumstances of the district in which these Churches were placed. On the one hand, Phrygia had been from the most remote antiquity the seat of the worship of Cybele, the goddess of nature, or "the Great Mother"; a worship of a very wild and enthusiastic character. On the other hand, Judaism had taken a strong hold of the people of these districts. Two centuries earlier, the king of Syria, Antiochus the Great (224-187), had caused two thousand Jewish families to remove from Babylon into this region, in order to secure the submission of the inhabitants, who were disposed to revolt (*Jos., Ant.*, xii. 3, § 4).

It is easy to understand that the combination of these two elements must have peculiarly predisposed the people to the adoption of doctrines at once legal and mystical, Jewish and superstitious. These are the very features of the doctrine against which Paul is arguing in the Epistle to the Colossians. On the one hand it presents a certain analogy with the Pharisaic Judæo-Christianity which, seven years before, had threatened to undermine the Churches of Galatia. It perpetuates the Jewish feasts, the observance of the new moons and Sabbaths, and of certain rules relating to food (ii. 16), possibly also of circumcision (ii. 11), as obligatory on all believers. But at the same time it is evident that, since the contests in Galatia and at Antioch, Judaising heresy had assumed quite a new character. We have already seen, in studying the Epistles to the Corinthians, that in attempting to reach the Greeks, Judæo-Christianity had stooped to unworthy and carnal allurements, and had attempted to clothe itself in a speculative garb, appealing especially to the craving for knowledge, and attempting to introduce a new Christology (2 Cor. xi. 4-6; 1 Cor. iii. 17-20). This tendency we note also in the Epistle to the Colossians. Paul calls the new teaching

“philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ.” It is an attempt to solve the problem of human life in a new way, leaving Christ out of the solution.

From this it would appear that the Judaising teachers who had come to the Church of Phrygia, while remaining attached to the observances of Mosaism, attempted at the same time to give them a higher bearing and to amalgamate them with a philosophic system. How was this? We can perhaps gather the answer from the words of the Apostle, in which he accuses them of taking pleasure in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into things not intended for their knowledge, vainly puffed up as they were by their fleshly mind (ii. 18). This verse, which some of the latest critics (Holzmann and von Soden) try to prove is an interpolation, is really the key to the whole epistle. It is objected that there is no connexion between the worship of angels and the legal side of the system. But from a Jewish point of view the connexion is obvious. Did not Stephen exclaim before the Sanhedrim, “Ye who received the law as it was ordained by angels and kept it not!” (Acts vii. 53). And Paul himself in writing to the Galatians, says, “The law was ordained through angels” (Gal. iii. 20). To revere the institutions of Moses was then to revere the angels by whom they had been delivered to the people, and consequently to assure the favour of those higher powers, to place themselves under their protection, to render themselves worthy of their heavenly communications and of the more sublime revelations of which they were the mediators. By means of the angels, Christians were to be initiated into that Divine world with the mysteries of which angels were familiar, and were to receive strength adequate to raise them to the standard of perfect holiness. By not rendering to the angels the worship due to them, and not observing

their ordinances, Christians might be deprived of their assistance and have to remain in the position of Gentiles—a position very inferior to that to which Israel had been raised by means of the law.

There is another consideration of still greater weight. In the opinion of the Jews, the Gentiles were under the sway of diabolic powers, the angels of darkness, to whom the idolatrous worship was offered. How could they be delivered from the dominion of these maleficent spirits? There could be but one way of escape; to place themselves under the leading of the angels of light, who alone could vanquish these unseen enemies of man. But for this end these heavenly spirits must be propitiated by scrupulous obedience to their precepts and by the worship which was their due.

Thus these two apparently diverse tendencies in the doctrine of the Judaising teachers at Colossæ are easily reconciled; and the attempt so often repeated to prove that we have in this Epistle two heterogeneous elements, falls to the ground. The argument has been, that the part of this epistle really written by St. Paul deals with a legalising Judæo-Christianity, differing somewhat from that of Galatia, but resting on the same basis. The other part of the epistle is said to be from the pen of a writer of the second century, and merely an interpolation. It is intended to refute the gnostic dualism of later times. The close relation which Judaism established between the giving of the law and the ministry of angels—a relation recognised by Paul himself (Gal. iv. 1-3)—forms the bond (disregarded by these scholars) between the legal and speculative elements of this new form of Judæo-Christian heresy.¹

¹ Holtzmann considers that out of the 95 verses in the Epistle to the Colossians, only 48 belong to the original letter sent by Paul. Von Soden thinks that only nine and a half verses (i. 15-20; ii. 10, 15, 18 b) are interpolated.

It will naturally be asked whether, as Pharisaism was unquestionably the basis of the old Judæo-Christianity antagonistic to Paul, so there was also a latent tendency in Judaism to produce this new form under which Judæo-Christianity manifested itself at Colossæ? The question suggests itself the more forcibly, because certain elements in the doctrine of the new teachers at Colossæ do not seem to arise naturally out of the law of Moses taken by itself. Thus Paul speaks of scruples in relation to certain drinks (ii. 16). Now there is no prohibition of this kind in the law, except the prohibition to priests to drink wine when about to perform their duties. We must suppose then that these Judæo-Christians at Colossæ, like those in Rome (Rom. xiv.), were under other influences than those of the law of Moses alone. And it is interesting to inquire whether at this period we shall discover in Judaism ascetic tendencies, like those which, as we have just shown, prevailed among the Judæo-Christians at Colossæ.

The most remarkable development of Judaism in this direction is Essenism. The sect of the Essenes took its rise probably in the middle of the second century before the Christian era. At the time of Paul it had become a powerful body. It would be erroneous to conclude, from the passage of Pliny referring to this sect, that it was confined to the solitudes around the Dead Sea. The Essenes who, as Philo tells us, numbered at that time 4,000, were spread all over Palestine, and were found in large numbers in the cities and villages of Judæa. They must have been very numerous in Jerusalem, for Josephus speaks of a gate which was called "the Gate of the Essenes," probably because it adjoined the house belonging to the order.

The Essenes formed in fact a caste apart. They lived together and had all things in common. The products of each one's labour belonged to the order, which provided for his wants. There were three principal degrees among the

Essenes, entered by successive stages of initiation. They bathed many times a day, particularly before meals, and after contact with any object regarded as impure, or even when a member of a higher degree had been touched by one of the lower. The food was prepared by superiors designated for the work, and partook of the character of an offering to God. The Essenes might not eat of viands not prepared in this way and sanctified by prayer. It is not certain whether they abstained altogether from wine and meat,—some writers hold the one view and some the other. That which is certain is that they held in abhorrence sacrifices of blood such as men offered in the Temple at Jerusalem. Hence they were excommunicated. But they maintained, nevertheless, the bond of union with their nation and with its worship, and sent every year offerings to the Temple. They abstained, as a rule, from marriage, though there were a few married men among them. They took no oath except the vow by which they entered the order. By this they were bound under the most terrible sanctions to fulfil all their duties towards God and their fellow-men, not to reveal to the uninitiated the things which they had been taught, and particularly to keep silence about their books and the names of the angels. They were very scrupulous in the observance of the Sabbath, and revered the name of Moses as the most sacred after that of God. Any one who spoke evil of Moses was to be punished with death. Like officiating priests, they were generally clothed in white linen. Just as the Pharisee was a development of literalised Judaism, so we may say that the Essene was the quintessence of Pharisaism, but with an added element of mysticism which seems to indicate some other influence at work than that of Judaism. The morning invocation addressed by the Essenes to the sun, their numerous lustrations, and the large development given by them to the doctrine of angels might suggest that

they had come under Parsee influence. The rejection of sacrifices of blood is in harmony with the Hindoo spirit. The wearing of white garments and the repudiation of marriage and of oaths, are features of the school of Pythagoras. It is difficult to decide between these various influences, which may indeed all have made themselves felt at this time on the life of the Jewish nation.

Somewhat later other off-shoots of Judaism give similar indications. Thus the doctrine of Cerinthus, who lived in the apostolic age, was a blending of Oriental theosophy and Jewish legalism. Some say he attributed to angels the creation of the world. In any case, he regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph, a pious Jew, with whom the Divine Christ was momentarily united. Cerinthus taught the permanent obligation upon Christians of the Jewish ceremonial law.

Still later, at the commencement of the second century, we note the appearance of a strange sect bearing clearly the impress of its Oriental origin, but arising out of the midst of Judæo-Christianity. Its leader, Elxaï (God hidden), brought from Persia a new doctrine contained in a book which had fallen from heaven. Christ Himself had appeared to Elxaï as a gigantic angel, accompanied by the Holy Spirit, His sister. This Christ is, according to Elxaï, a creature. He becomes incarnate again and again. Men are united to Him by baptism, calling to witness the seven elements (*ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν στοιχείων ὁμολογίᾳ*), namely, heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer, oil, salt, and earth. There are auspicious and ill-fated days; good angels preside over the one and bad angels over the other. The Sabbath and the third day of the week are to be observed, and nothing must be begun on the days ruled over by the evil angels. The Elkesaïtes used incantations by means of chanted formulas (*ἐπωδαί*), also invocations to demons (*δαιμονίων ἐπικλήσεις*). They had a profound contempt for the Apostle Paul.

The appearance of this sect at the beginning of the second century reveals, like those of earlier date, and others which we might mention, the existence of tendencies at once legalising and mystical in the midst of the Judæo-Christianity even of the first century. Consequently we cannot wonder at the intrusion into Asia Minor of a doctrine such as that described in the Apostle's polemics as we have sketched them.

Let us now follow the thread of the epistle itself, and see how the Apostle fights the old enemy under the new mask. He has now to contend with legalism not as a meritorious ground of salvation, but as an ascetic means for attaining a state of sanctification and higher illumination. That which would strike the Apostle most painfully in this new doctrine was the absence of Him who should be all in all—of Jesus Christ, who in the Apostle's eyes was Himself *Salvation*. By their doctrine of the mediation of angels, the new teachers at Colossæ set aside Jesus the one Mediator. As the Apostle says, they did not hold *the Head*, the vital principle of the whole body (ii. 19). We can understand how, in this epistle, he directs all his attention to this central point—Christ; what He is, what He has done, what we have in Him. Christ being once reinstated in His true place, the false doctrine will naturally fall to the ground.

Hence it is that after giving thanks for the work done by Epaphras at Colossæ (i. 1-8), and referring to the intercessory prayer which he is constantly offering to God for his converts that the work may be carried on unto perfection by Him who had translated them out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (9-14), Paul passes on at once to his main subject—the person and work of Christ; the supreme dignity of the one, the boundless extent of the other. This passage (15-23) opens

the first, or what might be called the didactic part of the epistle, which goes on to the end of chapter i.

Christ, regarded in His relation to God, is He in whom God reveals Himself, as the soul of a man comes out in his face. Christ, regarded in His relation to the world, was before all things, for He was the Son begotten not created. And not only was He before all things, but He was the *Author* of all things. "For by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created by Him and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist" (15-17).

That which He is to the universe He is, in a special sense, to the Church, with which He stands in a still more intimate relation. It is by His death and resurrection that the Church has been called into being, and from the bosom of His glory He imparts to it His glorious life, as the head gives life and leading to the body (18, 19).

And He thus in all things, material and spiritual, has the pre-eminence, because it pleased the Father that in Him should all the fulness of created things dwell and be consummated. God has made all things by Him, because He would that all things should be for Him. This leads Paul to set forth the work of Christ, by which this bringing together of all things in Him is made possible. He speaks here of the reconciliation not only of things on earth, but of things in heaven, by the blood of the cross. Does he mean then to teach that Christ died for the reconciliation of the fallen angels also, or for the justification of angels not fallen but imperfect in the eyes of the Holy, Holy, Holy God?

Paul does not add here $\tau\hat{\omega}$ Θεῷ, *with God*, as he does in 2 Cor. v. 18-20, but says only εἰς αὐτόν, *with or in relation to Him*. The thought thus expressed may therefore be

understood without necessarily going beyond the sphere whether of Biblical teaching in general or that of the Apostle in particular. The angels, as we have seen, were the Divine mediators in the giving of the law. How then could they have beheld without deep sorrow the countless transgressions both of Israel and of mankind at large? How could they have acquiesced in a general amnesty which would set at nought the Divine threatenings unless it were accompanied by a solemn tribute paid to the holy law of God by the shedding of atoning blood? As it is the blood of the Son of God which makes it possible for a holy God to pardon, so it is the blood also which reconciles the holy angels both with a pardoning God and with the pardoned sinners, and brings them into harmony with His plan of Divine mercy. Thus the cross brings together in one all these divergent wills in heaven and on earth, and inaugurates the return to the final unity which is God's design for the universe. By it the first and the second creation are blended in one and the same work (21-23). Thus those orders of angelic beings whom the teachers in Colossæ prided themselves on knowing, whom they perhaps, like Cerinthus, regarded as the creators of the universe, to whom they assigned the part of mediators between God and man, thus derogating from the sole mediatorial prerogative of Christ, were, in Paul's argument, reduced to their true position as His creatures, existing only for Him, who were reconciled to men through His atoning death and brought into harmony with the purposes of God. How significant this reversal of the parts!

This is the groundwork of the whole epistle. To it the Apostle adds two very important though subordinate thoughts. First, that the Colossians and the Gentile Christians in general have their own place in the great whole of a world made new by the cross, and that this place will be perpetuated to them if they continue in the faith which has

brought them into it (21-23). Second, that it is by the ministry of Paul who now writes to them, that the portion of this glorious plan which concerns the Gentiles at large and them in particular is to be wrought out. To the sufferings by which Christ accomplished their salvation, it is given to him to add, as a complement, those which at the time of his writing and throughout his whole life he is enduring in order that he may carry this blessed message to the ends of the earth, and may bring the Church, the body of Christ, to the measure of His perfect stature (24-29). In the words "if ye continue in the faith" grounded and stedfast, we have an indication of the danger that threatened the Colossian Church. This apprehension takes still more definite shape from the commencement of chap. ii., and forms the natural transition to the second or polemical part of the epistle (ii. 1-iii. 4).

Paul has just reminded the Colossians of what Christ is and what He has done. It only remains for them to apprehend what they possess in Him and in His work, that they may see the futility of the things which some are urging them to add to this great and perfect salvation.

The Apostle begins by expressing his concern for them, for though he has never seen them, he is nevertheless their apostle. He has heard that a doctrine is being preached to them which is called philosophy, but which is in reality only vain deceit; for it is based upon the traditions of men, and points to outward observances as of saving efficacy, instead of to the work and teaching of Christ (ii. 1-8).

These outward observances Paul calls by a name which we shall meet with again in the second century, in the doctrine of the *Elkesaites*. He speaks of them as the rudiments or elements of the world. This term he had already used (Gal. iii. 9) with the epithets "poor and beggarly," and the following verse, in which Paul speaks of the Jewish feasts, of the observance of "days and months and seasons

and years," shows to what he was referring in the word *elements*. He means that these were outward and earthly things upon which these teachers were trying to build up the religious life. The meaning is obviously the same in the Epistle to the Colossians. In Col. ii. 16 he refers to feast days, such as new moons and Sabbath days. Then in ver. 20 he again uses the same expression, "*rudiments*," applying it to the minute regulations of the false doctors: "Touch not, taste not, handle not." This leaves no doubt as to the thought that was in his mind in ver. 8. The philosophy against which he would put the Colossians on their guard is false in two aspects. First, in its origin. It does not confine itself to re-introducing the ordinances of Moses; but enforces also the arbitrary and purely human prescriptions which had been added by the rabbis,³ and of which Jesus speaks in almost the same terms as the Apostle: "Ye have made void the word of God because of your traditions. Well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Matt. xv. 6-9). Then this philosophy is false as to its *substance*. It connects salvation with external rites of a material nature, without relation to the moral life of man. Not so with the true gospel, the wisdom of which is "after Christ." This Paul shows when he sets forth all the fulness of that salvation which is given us in the person and by the work of Christ, described in chap. i. (ii. 9-15). All the *fulness* of life and of divine perfection dwells in Christ under a bodily form; if then we are united to Him we have all fulness in Him, and have no need to seek anything from those principalities and powers, of whom He is Himself the Head (ver. 9, 10). The consecration which the Jew received through the circumcision of the flesh, the Colossians received in a more excellent way, through baptism, which by uniting

them to the death and resurrection of Christ, made them die inwardly to sin and live again in Him with a new life (ii. 11-13). What folly to wish after that to bring them back to circumcision! Who would circumcise a man who had died and risen again? There are three characteristics of this new life possessed in Christ—the forgiveness of sins, which the old sacrifices could never procure; freedom from the threatenings of the law—the handwriting which God has Himself annulled, nailing it to the cross of Christ; lastly, deliverance from the power of the evil spirits which ruled the pagan world, but which were despoiled by Christ of their power and glory, He triumphing openly over them in His cross (ii. 13-15). The first of these verses shows the reason for the abolition of ceremonial worship; the second shows the uselessness, as far as the believer is concerned, of all legal institutions; the third is intended to free the believer from all superstitious fear of the maleficent power of the angels of darkness. As he has nothing to seek from the good angels, so he has nothing to dread from the bad. Paul now contrasts this description of the glorious standing of believers in Christ with the method of the spiritual life set before the Colossians by their new teachers.

To these men pardoned, enfranchised, endued with a new life, divinely kept, are now presented as saving ordinances, certain sumptuary regulations and the observance of sacred days—things which had some sort of value before the coming of Christ, but which are empty and meaningless since His manifestation and the living union of believers with Him (ii. 16, 17). The new teachers enjoin the worshipping of angels; they dazzle the Christians with the suggestion of new revelations to be obtained through these celestial spirits. They pretend to have access to a higher world by visions which are only the effect of carnal excitement (18); and they do not cherish the union with the glorified Christ, that Head of the body who alone imparts

a power of vital growth to all the members (19). But, says Paul, *you* who have been raised together with Christ, are no longer under the dominion of material elements. Your spiritual life no longer depends on the things you touch, taste and handle. These three prohibitions laid upon them: "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch," apply probably, the first to marriage, the second to the use of certain foods, the third to contact with material objects. We find various examples of such prohibitions among the Essenes. But all these petty regulations which deal only with the perishable element of our nature are after all but a tribute, such as ill becomes the believer, paid to the powers of the flesh (22, 23). Being once risen with Christ you have but one thing to do, to live as men raised from the death of sin, seeking only those things which are above in that higher world in which you already live with Christ, while awaiting your own manifestation with Him in glory (iii. 1-4).

Hence instead of enforcing these purely outward observances which are of no avail, the Apostle urges the Colossian Christians to mortify all sinful inclinations. Instead of an imaginary rapture with the angels, he urges them to share the risen life of Jesus by the holy aspirations of a heart at one with him. This leads him on to the third and practical part of the Epistle (iii. 5-iv. 1).

However real is this death unto sin and union with the glorified Saviour wrought in the Christian soul, it is but a beginning, and the task of the faithful through the rest of their earthly life is to labour for the perfecting of this work, both by putting off more and more the evil tendencies of the old corrupt heart (5-9) and by putting on the new nature which makes them all one in Christ (10-14).

This is the twofold task of the individual Christian. But the Colossians have also a duty as a Church. They are to be at peace one with another, and to promote each

other's edification and joy by psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (15, 16). The bondage of fear under which their heretical teachers would have placed them, certainly could not have conduced to this end.

Lastly, from the life of the individual and of the Church, Paul passes to *family* life. This is the first time we have found him touching on this subject. In the Epistle to the Romans he had spoken of the duties of the Christian as a member of the State (Rom. xiii.); doubtless because he was addressing himself to the Christian community which inhabited the political capital of the world. In the Epistle to the Colossians, he sets forth the duties of family life, probably because the new teachers with their false spiritualism had spoken doubtfully of the sacredness of marriage. He begins by laying down in ver. 17 a general principle which includes all he has to say. "Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." He then proceeds to apply this principle to the various relations which constitute family life, and first of all to the central relation—that of husband and wife (18, 19). Next to the inner circle of parents and children, and lastly to the outer circle of the home life, the relation of masters and servants (iii. 22–iv. 1). This concludes the Epistle. All that remains is the sending of special messages of remembrance and greeting (iv. 2–18).

He enjoins the Colossians to be steadfast in prayer, and specially to intercede for him. He urges them to be wise and considerate in their dealings with the unconverted around them (2–6). He tells them that Tychicus his beloved fellow-labourer is shortly about to visit them, and that Onesimus will come with him. He calls Onesimus his "faithful and beloved brother," being anxious to assure a welcome for him. He does not say much of himself or of how he is placed, because all this these two messengers will tell them by word of mouth (7–9). Then follow

messages from his fellow-labourers, and first from three who were Jews by birth and the only ones among his countrymen who had remained faithful—Aristarchus, who had accompanied him from Caesarea to Rome; Mark, who had come thither to join him; and Jesus Justus. Mark was cousin to Barnabas, who out of love to this kinsman had separated from Paul. Mark was now on the point of leaving again for Asia Minor. Paul next mentions three evangelists of Gentile origin—Epaphras, the pastor of the Colossians, who never ceases to pray for them and for the Christians at Laodicea and Hierapolis; Luke the beloved physician; and Demas, to whose name he joins no honourable epithet, as if he already had a presentiment that he would be unfaithful (see 2 Tim. iv. 10; ver. 10–14).

Three commissions follow—a salutation to the Church at Laodicea, and to Nymphas in whose house it met; then a direction to forward this letter to Laodicea and to receive from thence the letter written by the Apostle to that Church; lastly a charge to Archippus, who was probably the son of Philemon and was taking the place of Epaphras during his absence.

The Apostle concludes with his own salutation, reminding them touchingly of his captivity, and desiring that grace may be with them all.

There is perfect logical unity in this epistle. As the Epistle to the Galatians groups itself entirely around the idea of Christian liberty, in relation to the law, so the central idea of the Epistle to the Colossians is the perfect sufficiency of Christ for our salvation. As the Epistle to the Galatians contains, first an apology in which Paul proves the complete independence of his mission and of his teaching (the apostolate of liberty); then a didactic portion in which he shows the agreement of his doctrine with the Old Testament (the doctrine of liberty); and lastly a practical part which gives the picture of the life of the

believers under the holy discipline of love (the life in the liberty); so the Epistle to the Colossians divides itself also into three parts, the first didactic, in which Paul sets forth the divinity of Christ and the greatness of His work; the second polemical, in which he shows the Colossians all the fulness of the salvation which is theirs in Christ, and as a consequence the futility of the miserable makeshifts for sanctification and higher illumination which have been offered them; lastly, a practical part, in which he draws the picture of human life, especially family life, renewed and sanctified by the life of Christ. The objections to the general authenticity of this epistle are now altogether abandoned even by those who think that it has been more or less interpolated. If the Apostle's vocabulary differs considerably from that of the previous epistles this is not to be wondered at where there was a mind so creative as that of Paul; and it is indeed accounted for by the entirely new nature of the heresy he had to combat. He had to deal with new dogmas—the mediation of angels and their supposed hierarchy; legal ordinances regarded as an ascetic method by which the faithful might be prepared to receive new revelations to supplement those given by Christ. In dealing with such errors the Apostle was constrained to employ a new vocabulary largely derived from that of his adversaries. Any forger attempting to pass off this Epistle as written by St. Paul, would have scattered it thickly with expressions taken from his known epistles, such as “works,” “justification,” etc., which never occur in this letter. Do we not feel, moreover, as we read the personal references at the close of the epistle, which are so free from any attempt at legendary amplification, that they would have no meaning in an apocryphal writing, composed long after the death of the Apostle? In fine, it would be hard for any writer to counterfeit so happily an epistle of St. Paul's, and to reproduce the

vigour of thought and terseness of style which make his writings so powerful.

All that the critics of to-day venture to do then is to impeach the integrity of this Scripture. They grant that the Apostle really wrote a letter to the Colossians, and that this authentic epistle is contained in the canon of Scripture. But they say that some interpolator of the second century got hold of the epistle and introduced into it arguments against the gnostics of his day, so as to lend to his polemics the authority of St. Paul. They dispute, for example, the authenticity of the passage in chap. i. on the divinity of Christ; of the passages relating to the invocation of angels, etc. But it would be difficult to explain how an interpolator could have so skilfully woven his thoughts into the tissue of those of St. Paul, that the hiatus is nowhere to be discovered. Beside, the apostolic writings were not at the mercy of any chance writer. They were deposited with the archives of the Churches to which they were addressed, and we fail to conceive how the interpolator could have disguised his fraud. If he had made his interpolations on the original manuscript, they would have been obvious to the first reader. If he had substituted a new and enlarged MS. for the old simpler one, the Church which read and re-read the writings of the Apostle, and passed them on to any Churches which asked for them (Col. iv. 16), would have quickly discovered it. Again we ask, What is it that the critics propose to omit? The grand passage on the divinity of Christ in chap. i.? But this is to the rest of the epistle what the head is to the body. If we remove that we leave but a torso. Or are ver. 10, 15, 18 of the second chapter to be eliminated? We have seen what a necessary part they are of the whole argument of the epistle, and how closely connected with its fundamental thought.

At the basis of these criticisms, whether of the whole letter or of some of its more striking passages, there lies, I admit, one very just observation. The world in which the thought of the Apostle is moving is no longer the same as that to which he was addressing himself in the previous epistles. In them he dealt chiefly with the method of justification, the way in which sinful man might attain to reconciliation with God. Now the subject is altogether different. Paul is addressing himself to Christians already rooted and grounded in Christ (i. 23), those who have died and risen again with Him (ii. 20, 21), and he unfolds before their view the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are in Christ (ii. 3). He traces His Divine personality to its source. He shows the vast future consequences of His work, which after binding together Jews and Gentiles upon earth, is one day to bind together men and angels under the same headship. This universal operation of the work of Christ is connected with the supreme dignity of His person. He is the Alpha because He is to be the Omega. The foundation of the Church by the Risen Saviour is the commencement of a spiritual work by means of which the history of the universe is to be consummated. Christ and the Church; this is the key to the Divine plan in the government of the universe.

It is sometimes asked, were these sublime ideas, of which we get only glimpses in the earlier epistles, new discoveries to the mind of the Apostle? Assuredly not. The divinity of Christ was from the very first an integral element of his teaching. It was as the Son of God that Christ had been revealed to him on the way to Damascus (Gal. i. 16). To this Christ, Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, had attributed the creation of all things, and the conduct of Israel through the wilderness. Of this Christ he had said in his second Epistle to the

same Church, that He had emptied Himself of His Divine riches to enter into human poverty (2 Cor. viii. 9). Paul understood the Old Testament too well not to know that the appearance of the Christ was looked for by the prophets as the supreme manifestation of the *Angel of the Face*, the Adonai Himself (Mal. iii. 1).

But he was led to expand these truths by the new ascetic and mystical, we might almost say gnostic form which Judæo-Christianity was assuming at this time in Asia Minor. This treasury of sublime thoughts as to the relation sustained by Christ, first to the Church and then to the universe at large, was so present with him when he wrote his earlier letters that he distinctly alludes to it in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. What else can be the meaning of the declaration (ii. 16), "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect"? Paul means to say that when he finds himself with believers who are strong and settled in the Christian life, he is not afraid to unfold before their eyes the higher wisdom contained in the appearing and work of Christ.

Such an occasion had arisen when he was called to write to these Churches in Phrygia, which false teachers were trying to bewilder with the glamour of a wisdom higher than that revealed in Christ. It is interesting to observe how St. Paul, as he rises to these heights in his Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians, stands on the same glorious summit as the Apostle John, and joins in the same anthem with him, though in other words. For after all, has not the figure of the head and the body precisely the same significance as that of the vine and the branches? As he stands on this lofty height, St. Paul reaches up to, but does not go beyond, that which is most sublime in the teaching of Christ.

Would it be difficult to find among Christians of to-day, men who are eager for revelations of things behind

the veil, higher than those which Christ has been pleased to give us, and who seek for them by methods which Paul would have described as the rudiments of the world? Would it not be easy to find many Christians who make their salvation hinge on things which affect only the perishable part of our being, and interpose between themselves and heaven other mediators beside the One in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead?

The letter to the Colossians was sent from Rome. Would it not be well to send it back to its cradle?

F. GODET.

SOME GLEANINGS FROM ST. PETER'S HARVEST-FIELD.

ST. PETER'S EPISTLES.

II.

ST. PETER IN SACRED HISTORY COMPARED WITH HIS OWN SELF-DELINEATION IN HIS EPISTLES.

“The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ.”—1 PETER v. 1.

I HAVE no intention at present of dwelling upon any of the ecclesiastical questions which no doubt underlie the opening part of this verse. The question of *Episcopacy* is one of *principle* and of *fact*, not of *name*. For all the sweet humility of tone and language, there is nothing inconsistent with apostolic majesty. For all the unconscious dignity, there is nothing of a pontiff's arrogance. Yet, as the voice rings out, gathering strength as it rises, we feel that no mere teacher of a congregation could have issued such a charge. Behind the idea of the pastoral life which he describes with such nervous brevity, is the consciousness of

a great office, and behind that the very words of Christ. "Tend the flock," he says, with one of those wonderfully pregnant aoristic imperatives,¹ which gather up the whole purpose of a life into one single act looked at as if past. And, as he utters the word, the voice of Christ is in his ear, as he heard it so many years before upon the shore of the Lake of Galilee, "Tend My sheep."²

Our subject however at present points to the characteristics of St. Peter in his Epistles as compared with the delineation of his words and deeds in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles.

1. In the Acts St. Peter appears as emphatically an orator. He had the passionate, impulsive nature, the stuff of which powerful speakers are made. Grace had added to this natural endowment that witchery of heaven which in a preacher is called unction. We all know that in really great sermons there is much which baffles the best reporters. The discourses preserved in the Acts are but faithful summaries of the line of argument which was adopted—in the case of St. Peter as of St. Paul, so characteristic and so strongly marked by peculiarities of language, that one is tempted to think of revision by the hand of the speaker.

In the discourses themselves, as developed and expanded before large and excited audiences, the Apostle spoke in his own language, the popular speech of the Jews of Palestine.³ He does not now enjoy the same advantage. He writes, or dictates, in Greek, which he cannot wield with such freedom. Indeed it was conjectured so long ago as by St. Jerome that Silvanus was employed by Peter as amanuensis and interpreter, and that to this we may attribute in some

¹ ποιμένας, 1 Pet. v. 2.

² John xxi. 17.

³ Not pure Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic. Many peculiarities might with equal propriety be termed either Hebraisms or Syriasms. See Winer, *Grammar of New Testament Diction*, Part i. § 3, and the authorities there quoted on peculiarities of the idiom of the N.T. manifestly derived from a non-Hellenic source.

degree the Pauline tinge which may be detected in the language.¹

The style of the Epistles is certainly that of an orator. He has the glow of thought, the wheels which catch fire by their own motion, the rush of accumulated synonyms. Not seldom he brings the hammer down three times on the anvil before he is content to leave off striking.² He finds lofty and sonorous epithets. Much has been tauntingly made of St. Luke's statement that Peter and John were "unlearned and ignorant men." But one who knew the Hebrew Bible and the version of the LXX. certainly, also, if we believe some critics, Philo and Josephus, was already in possession of a noble literature and a whole "sacred library." And St. Peter knew the Old Testament through and through. It is a snow through which we can continually track his footsteps. Even in the words before us, possibly a translation by himself or by Silvanus, we recognise the fire and passion which bowed assembled thousands. We see that his language, when the soul was at white heat, and when he was not fain to use a tongue not quite so familiar as his own, must have been ample, sonorous, picturesque, pathetic, tender, indignant, as the subject demanded.

Other oratorical features may be noted. He possesses the art of giving form to mental processes and clothing

¹ 1 Pet. v. 12. Possibly he did not enjoy the same advantage in the Second Epistle, which might account for certain obvious differences of style. The whole connexion of Silvanus with St. Paul is of deep interest in its bearing upon our Epistles. Silvanus was known as a faithful and attached follower of Paul to the *very* Churches which Peter addresses (1 Pet. i. 1; Acts xv. 37, 40; Gal. ii. 12, 13). He is connected with St. Paul in his earliest Epistles (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). We hear no more of him in Acts or St. Paul's Epistles until he reappears here and is honourably mentioned with Mark. Let us remember that St. Paul rebuked Peter in an Epistle to the Galatians, to whom among others the latter now writes (Gal. ii. 11, 14; 1 Pet. i. 1). Yet throughout both Epistles Peter offers attestation to Paul as a friend and writer of canonical Scripture (1 Pet. v. 12; 2 Pet. i. 12, iii. 15, 16), and here indicates that Silvanus, who had been faithful to Paul, was faithful to him also.

² 1 Pet. i. 4, 8, 19; ii. 1, 5; iii. 3; v. 19.

ideas with palpable shapes. "Gird up the loins of your mind"; "arm yourselves with the same mind"; "be clothed with humility"; "tend the flock of God."¹ The homely illustrations which the people love come readily to his hand—sometimes tender, as the new-born babe, whose whole little life is just a desiring of mother's milk and nothing else;² sometimes awful, with all its unadorned outspokenness,—“whose damnation *dozeth* not.”³ His righteous scorn can utter itself in a very plain proverb.⁴

The effective preacher must also have elevation and winningness. He must be able to bring the far-off sky a little nearer, and show us the sweet distance where earth melts away into the blue of heaven.⁵ His tone must have softness. He must not perpetually be shouting his dogma through a speaking-trumpet; his “doctrine must drop as the rain, his speech distil as the dew.” How soft a breathing, how tender a fall is there, when he speaks in Acts of “seasons of *refreshing*.”⁶ How gentle a lullaby for God's tired children there is in this—“the spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you.”⁷

In these respects the speaker in Acts might be the writer of the Epistles. The style is that of an orator.

3. Once more. Numbers of touches in St. Peter's Epistles presuppose incidents in the Gospels. They are natural as coming from one who had been in that peculiar relation. They are not obtrusive assertions;⁸ they are latent.⁹

¹ 1 Pet. i. 13; iv. 1-v. 5; cf. 2 Pet. i. 9.

² 1 Pet. ii. 2.

³ 2 Pet. ii. 3.

⁴ 2 Pet. ii. 22.

⁵ 1 Pet. i. 4, 13.

⁶ *καὶ ποτὶ ἀναψύξεως*, Acts iii. 19. The thought in the verse—repentance, “that sins may be blotted out, so that there may come seasons of refreshing, and that He may send the Christ,” is exactly the doctrinal equivalent of “looking for and hastening on the coming of the day of God” (2 Pet. iii. 12), so poorly travestied by our latest rationalism.

⁷ *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται*, 1 Pet. iv. 4.

⁸ Hence for my present purpose I shall not refer to the mention of the Transfiguration, 2 Pet. i. 17, 18; but 2 Pet. i. 14 compared with John xxi. 18, 19 is an exact instance of a case in point.

⁹ So much so that the reference in 1 Pet. v. 5 (“Be clothed with humility)

For instance, the very name of Peter must have brought solemn thoughts to the Apostle's mind. With us men, names are only marks by which one member of the community is distinguished from another. But names given by God are not only connotative, they are essential and prophetic. One night Jacob wrestled in prayer until break of day; then the old nature of the crafty planner sank in the fires of agony, and from the ashes there rose a new man, with a new and noble nature, and a new and princely name as its expression—Israel.¹ When Andrew brought Simon his brother for the first time to Jesus, Jesus saw the strong man with his faith of granite under the fluid surface of that mobile nature. "Jesus looked upon him"—almost looked *into* him²—"and said, Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, Peter."³

Let us then turn to the great *Petrine* passage in the second chapter of this Epistle.⁴ There is, indeed, such a quick play of hallowed imagination round the passage quoted from Isaiah,⁵ that some of the colours elude our power of description. But all the radiance comes from "a living Stone," "living stones."⁶ That great thought of life, living, has ever a charm for Peter.⁷ Here we have it, "living stones" in relation to Christ. "Living stone," and that stone the corner stone; and that (to use another favourite *Petrine* word) *precious*,⁸ the very Koh-i-noor of God. "And for you that believe is all that preciousness"! In France

to Jesus "girding Himself with a towel and washing the disciples' feet" (John xiii. 4-8), with which Peter is so closely associated, has been until quite lately overlooked; at least, after diligent search in a good library, I can find no notice of the reference before Dean Alford. Once made, it has been invariably recognised.

¹ Gen. xxx. 11, 28.

² ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ.

³ John i. 43.

⁴ 1 Pet. ii. 4-9.

⁵ Isa. xxviii. 16.

⁶ 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.

⁷ "The Son of the living God," Matt. xvi. 16. "The Prince of life," Acts iii. 15. "The grace of life," 1 Pet. iii. 7, cf. v. 10. "A living hope," 1 Pet. i. 3.

⁸ 1 Pet. i. 7, 19; 2 Pet. i. 1, 4.

it is not unusual to call believers contemptuously "fossils" or "petrifications." Petrifications! We accept the word, but we are petrified into life.

Again. It is natural for pious old people to be most anxious about those whom they love in regard to those qualities in which their own deficiency has been proved in the day of trial. There were two graces in which Peter had been found wanting—stedfastness¹ and humility, especially the first. Think of the intense prayer at the close, with its rush of accumulated synonyms—"the God of all grace shall Himself perfect, establish, strengthen, settle you."² Remember the exhortation—"ye younger, be subject unto the elder. Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility: for God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."³

How the words of Jesus would come back to his mind in relation to his ministry, we have already indicated.⁴

We have also adverted to the noble weight and urgency of meaning in the aoristic imperative, which would lead the pastor to look upon his work as one in the light of an eternal world. Of the two imperatives, the present is dispassionate, measured, and directly practical; the aoristic is emotional, stringent, unifying, almost prophetic; it throws a man forward, and places him in a position where he can take in the whole field as one. And the imperative is a favourite of Peter's yearning and forward-moving soul. Be ye such pastors, that when ye look back your whole life shall be gathered into one "tending," one great unbroken shepherd act.⁵

¹ For Peter's weakness, Matt. xiv. 30, 31; Mark xiv. 66, 67. His commission to *strengthen*, given, Luke xxii. 32; exercised, 1 Pet. v. 10, 11; 2 Pet. i. 12; ii. 14; iii. 16, 17.

² "Digna *Petro* oratio. Cf. Luke xxii. 32." Bengel. ³ 1 Pet. v. 6, 7.

⁴ To Peter in the Gospel, Jesus says βόσκει (John xxi. 15), ποιμαίνει, ver. 16, βόσκει, ver. 17. St. Peter in his Epistle says ποιμαίνει, 1 Pet. v. 2.

⁵ See the beautiful aoristic imperative in 1 Pet. i. 13 (τελείως ἐλπίζατε: "Make your whole life one act of hope"). See also i. 22; v. 5, 8.

In the text the writer of this Epistle indicates, in his unobtrusive way, that he was a spectator of the sufferings of Christ. To the pathos of that perfect death he has already devoted, in an earlier part of the Epistle, perhaps the fullest development which it has found anywhere outside the Gospels. "Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example that you should follow His steps." The word "example" means literally, not probably the sketch of a picture to be closely followed, but merely a copy book² with head-lines for the child to follow with feeble fingers. The Passion is described for the benefit of "servants,"³ and made to yield a lesson for their lives of suffering. The whole picture unrolls itself again. There are three imperfections. "He was not resisting," "was not threatening," "was committing Himself."⁴ Then the one act: "Who bore our sins in His own Body up to and on the Tree,"⁵ Himself by His own personal endurance.⁶

This, as has been said, is probably the longest passage upon the death of Jesus outside the Gospels in the New Testament. Yet to modern feeling there is no doubt that it will seem rather sternly reserved. It is the declaration of an eye-witness who reveres truth too much to use words lightly, whose pathetic eloquence is restrained by a boundless reverence. With a view to his special purpose, the spiritual instruction of "servants," he chooses each hue and colour of his picture. A noble instinct gives severe sobriety to his language; orator as he is, and passionate as he is, this is holy ground, and he dare make no concession to mere rhetorical effect. Certainly he was an eye-witness. Much that he saw is recorded in the Gospel of St. Mark. The reviling and threatening he saw. To the last word in

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 20-25.

² ὑπογράμμων.

³ Accurately the word here (οἰκέται, ver. 18) should be so rendered, *not* "slaves."

⁴ ἀντιλοιδορεῖ, ἡπείλει, παρεδίδου (ver. 23).

⁵ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον (ver. 24).

⁶ ὃς αὐτὸς (ver. 24).

which Jesus commended His soul to His Father, he makes significant allusion once and again.¹ But much he failed to see through his own fault, through the failure of his faith. The noble silence; the brave patience; the mockery in which He did not threaten; the cruel taunts to that gentle soul; the lurid weal upon the crushed flesh under the tremendous Roman thong, sharpened with bone or lead;² all that he saw. But he did not see the wounds, or the riven heart, or the flowing blood—only the cross and its burden in that lurid light, as the traveller might see a Calvary upon a southern peak some summer day. “The author of the First Epistle of Peter,” writes M. Renan, “*could* not have known the incident in St. Luke—‘when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, He said, Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit—’³ or he must have mentioned it.” In all probability, he *does* refer to it, as we have seen. M. Renan might as well have said that he did not know of the nails or spear; that he had not seen Pilate or Judas; that he knew nothing of that tender, pathetic look, when “the Lord turned and looked upon Peter.” But he who can cut exquisitely chiselled sentences for an academy may be unable to read the heart of a saint.

St. Peter, then, witnessed to those sufferings which he actually saw—witnessed them to the Christians of Pontus and of those other places which he mentions; to the furthest shores which his sails ever reached; witnesses them now to the millions who hear and read the New Testament, an abiding “witness of the sufferings of Christ.”

This witness is a principle that reaches far.

Each life and character is meant to become a living sacrifice. “Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves also at once and finally with the same thought”⁴—the whole in-minding, in-thinking, from which

¹ Cf. Luke xxiii. 46, with 1 Pet. ii. 23; iv. 19.

² οὐ τῷ μῶλωπι (ver. 24).

³ Luke xxiii. 46.

⁴ 1 Pet. iv. 1.

actions flow¹—the same thought as Christ's. "Christianity is stamped with the image of the cross, and the whole life of each true Christian has something of the form and look of Christ crucified."²

The witness of Christian art is not wholly to be overlooked. It has been said that we have lost by substituting a literal representation for a symbol. But after all the crucifixion was a fact, not an idea; the symbol is for the world of ideas, the literal representation for the world of history. At every stage of culture the representation has its use. A few years ago, a Red Indian missionary did a great work in Minnesota. The story of the man's conversion was this. He saw a picture of Calvary in a book, in a house where he had idly wandered in. "Why was this?" he asked. "For *you*," was the answer. And one of the noblest of missionary lives was in the reply. Who shall say that the pictured page was not blessed to become a "witness of the sufferings of Christ"?

But, above all, the burden of all true preaching is Christ crucified. In the Eastern and Western Churches, where the spiritual has a tendency to become petrified in forms, the bishop wears a pectoral cross to remind him of the text. In the Latin Churches of the West, the preacher, before beginning his sermon, plants the cross or crucifix in the pulpit. This practice is too demonstrative for us, not to speak of other objections. But whether he expound the Old Testament or the New; whether his subject be a duty, a dogma, an emotion, prayer or service, work or sacrament; all should fit like bits of enamel into a cross, and the preacher, like St. Peter, should be "a witness of the sufferings of Christ."

Sure I am that the longer we study the Epistle the deeper will be our impression that we have been in connexion with the spirit of one who saw Christ. Of the glory

¹ *ερωτα* (in Heb. iv. 12 in plural).

² *À Lap.*

that is to be revealed he was a partaker also, of the Pentecost, of the Second Advent, as of the Transfiguration. In those strange "spiritual exercises" which are sometimes so carnal; where so much is wrapped up in the *formula*, "as it is pious to suppose in meditation"—as if it were pious to suppose anything about the Lord of truth which is not true—there is one profound and beautiful thought. "If I am to meditate concerning the resurrection of Christ, I must ask for joy wherewith I may rejoice with Christ rejoicing."¹ Yes! For St. Peter begins with that burst of Easter joy, finding that hope is a flower which is rooted in Christ's grave, and blooms in His resurrection—"a hope living through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."² But, above all, he is a witness of Christ's sufferings. He saw them not merely as art displays them to the imagination. With a Vandyke upon the walls, we may be as worldly and godless as ever—as little moved to good as the selfish and cynical talkers round a rich table by the hues and odours of the clustered roses. He saw the cross, not thus, but as God would have us sinners see it, with its rebuke to sin,³ and the access to God which we may have by it.⁴ We have here only a leaflet, a few pages of dogma and duty to the pilgrim souls of the dispersion. But it is a true encyclical of one, called by millions "the first Pontiff," who died upon the Vatican, and never reigned there. We find in it Peter's own crucifix, blessed by him for all his spiritual children, which we may clasp with reverence, and "sanctify Christ as Lord in our hearts."⁵

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

¹ *Spiritual Exercises*, of Ignatius Loyola, pp. 28-113. ² 1 Pet. i. 3.

³ 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2.

⁴ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

⁵ 1 Pet. iii. 15.

ON THE SPREAD OF JEWISH-CHRISTIAN
RELIGIOUS IDEAS AMONG THE EGYPTIANS.¹

IN the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* for 1883, attention is called to the importance of the papyrus discovered in Egypt as affording an explanation of the spread of religious conceptions of a Jewish-Christian character among the Egyptian races. Indications of the fact had already been observed in the demotic papyri, and in the meantime, a fragment of extreme antiquity was found in the collection of papyri belonging to the Archduke Renier, in which mention is made of the forewarning of Peter's fall given by our Lord. This fragment I discovered in May, 1884, in the midst of a heap of other papyri to which it was firmly adhering, for indeed it is nothing uncommon to find a quantity of papyrus or parchment sheets that have lain for a long time together compacted into a solid mass. Now these papyri were all belonging to the period of the Roman Empire, and some of them bear the date of the time of Alexander Severus. In consequence of the palæographic marks upon these sheets, it must be prominently and emphatically stated, that originally this fragment most probably formed part of a papyrus roll. This view is also supported by the circumstance that it is written in long narrow columns and not in backward-written horizontal lines. In the fourth century after Christ, however, writing was seldom performed in this columnar fashion that had prevailed in the construction of the earlier rolls. The style of writing which characterises the fragment also indicates the pagan period of the Roman Empire rather than that of the fourth century. Especially deserving of attention is the form in which in line 4 the letters ασ of the word διασκορπισθησ . . . are written. The ter-

¹ Dr. Wessely who, as our readers know from the paper by Prof. Stokes (*Expositor*, third series, vol. i. p. 331, etc.), is engaged in the deciphering of the Fayûm MSS., has kindly sent us his article.—ED. EXPOSITOR.

minial stroke of the α is concluded thus—c, just like the ligature or cursive combination α , for $\alpha\varsigma$, as it is used in the writing of the Roman period. The contraction $\Pi\epsilon\tau$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\upsilon$ is also very striking. The letters and the points are written in red ink.¹

¹ Now certainly in private documents of that period we find abbreviations freely used, and, indeed, in the Ptolemean age we meet with a regular system of contractions. Compare, for example, the Vienna Papyrus, No. 26, in the *Wiener Studien*, 1881.

The historical progress in the art of abbreviation may be briefly indicated as follows :—

1. Among the earliest methods of abbreviation is the plan, a purely arbitrary one, of not writing out the word in full, without indicating in any way or by any sign that there is a contraction ; as, for example, ΑΘΗ , ΑΘΗΝ , etc. This might be called contraction in the most exact sense of the word. (See *Gardthausen*, 244.)

2. A more ambitious attempt is made in a style of contraction which we find prevailing especially in the Ptolemean period. The abbreviated word is written out till we come to a letter, chosen again in quite an arbitrary manner, but at the end of the abbreviation a characteristic letter is superscribed ; as, for example, $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho^{\eta}$ for $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\alpha$; $\delta\iota\sigma\pi\lambda$ for $\delta\iota\sigma\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, or the characteristic letter is subscribed, as in λ for $\lambda\iota\beta\acute{o}\varsigma$.

3. In the period of the Roman Empire the employment of contraction marks in the form of strokes, straight or crooked, was generally introduced.

4. From the time of Diocletian there was an inclination to employ abbreviations in such a way as would render it easier for the reader to find out the grammatical ending. This led also to the so-called plural abbreviation, which consists in the doubling of the final consonant ; as, for example, $\nu\omicron\mu\mu\alpha$ for $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha$. A further consequence of this endeavour was the so-called sacral contraction ; as, for example, $\theta\sigma$, $\theta\nu$, $\Theta\bar{\omega}$, $\Theta\bar{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\bar{\epsilon}$, $\iota\bar{\sigma}$, for $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$, $\Theta\epsilon\bar{\omega}$, $\Theta\epsilon\bar{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\epsilon$, Ἰησοῦς . From what has been said, it is evident that IHC for Ἰησοῦς is much older than IC for Ἰησοῦς ; so that IHC in later times would no longer be understood. In the same way, XP or X̅P for Christ is older than XC .

Generally in each successive period the abbreviation used in the preceding period would still continue in use.

We turn back now to the abbreviated word $\Pi\epsilon\tau$. It has not hitherto been investigated, and it is in respect of form absolutely singular ; indeed the very materials for estimating the significance of the two dots have not previously been in existence. All the more pleasing is it for me to have now at hand, for the purposes of my investigation, in an unpublished papyrus the means of explaining the origin and significance of those orthographical points. In the following citations from uncial papyri belonging to the very earliest years of the fourth century, which are moreover derived from sources undoubtedly a hundred years older, I produce passages from documents referring to magical arts which are preserved in Paris and London, previously laid by me before the public in my *Lettres à M. Revillout* (Paris : Ernest Leroux).

The magical papyri, or documents bearing upon magical arts, from which I have quoted in the note below, constitute the principal source for our consideration of the spread of religious conceptions of a Jewish-Christian kind. They had been drawn up during an age when there was a very remarkable favour shown to syncretism in regard to religious views and practices. Greek ideas and practices formed the basis of that system; but a secondary constituent element appears in these Egyptian papyri in the form of a multitude of Egyptian notions and myths, frequently expressed in the Egyptian language, the native terms being simply transcribed into Greek characters. This is true also of demotic papyri of this class. In yet more remarkable profusion the Jewish and Jewish-Christian element makes its appearance, so that a lengthy Greek passage is completely dominated by such ideas, and even affords examples of what are usually called Hebraisms. These interesting passages I now give in parallel columns in the original and in an English translation.

The simple point is used for such purposes and in such circumstances as the following:—

(1) It is used just like the two dots over the *i* and the *ü* at the beginning of words and over diphthongs, rarely in the middle of the word. *ἔπρον* 2188. *ὑπο* A 37. *ὑψωματι* 1155. *ὑψιστου* A 47. *ισον* 1718. *ιδιον* 3100. *ινα* 3179. *ισδαυγη* 2268. *ιαθουῖν* 387. *αιζων* 1083. *αιτησας* 2174. *βαῖσολβαί* 1663. *μεμνοῖνην* 1027. *μοί* 2548. *χρησοχοου* 2104. *εἰ* 1513. 1514. 1515. *αἰῖσσοις* 3061. *βίους* A 256.

(2) The point is used to indicate the beginning of the word, or, in the case of words joined together, the beginning of the root-word or of the syllables. It represents also the light breathing or the aspirate, and is used as an aspirate even in the middle of words. *παρθύπακουστας* 1369. *επ' αἰτηταριον* 2378. *νυκτάστραπτο* . . . 182. *μετ' εμου* 353. *ποτ' ε* 347. *τουτ'* 811. 2216. *δ'* 451. 2150. *σφρ'* 2846. *μηδ'* 451. *τ'* 2148. *αλλ'* 376. 379. 1180. 2074. *τρισσαν δ'* *εκατων* 2826. *εν* 66. *εἰ* 1513. 1514. 1515. *δηνεκως* 1219. *ο* for *ο* A 216. *άρσενος* 65. for **ΑΡ'ΕΝΟC** or *άρσενος*. *γλωττης* A 421. for **ΓΛΩΤ'ΤΗC**. *γλωτταν* A 298. *αγγέλος* A 141. *εξαγγέλω* A 287.

3. The point is also used to show that a contraction has been made, as in the case of **Π'ΕΤ** for *Πέτρον*. *αλλ'* *γ* for *ἄλλα τρία* 1106. *ππ* for *πόππυσον* 578.

It is evident, then, from what has been said, that the papyrus must be assigned to the period before Constantine.

Ἡρὸς δαιμονιαζομένους Ἡβήχεως
δόκιμον.

Λαβὼν ἔλαιον ὀμφακίζοντα μετὰ
βοτάνης μαστιγίας καὶ λωτομήτρας
ἔψει μετὰ γαμψούχου ἀχρωπίστου
λέγων ἰωηλ ὠσσαρθιωμι εμωρι θεω-
χιψοιθ σιθεμεωχ σωθη ἰωη μιμι-
ψωθιωωφ φερσωθι αειριουω ἰωη
εωχαριφθα ἔξελθε ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίνα-
κούτον.

Τὸ δὲ φυλακτήριον ἐπὶ λαμινῷ
κασσιτερίνῳ γράφε· ἱαηω. αβρα
ωχθιωχ· φθα· μεσειντιαιω· φεωχ.
ιαηω. χαρσοκ. καὶ περιάπτε τὸν
πάσχοντα πάντος δαίμονος φρικτὸν
ὃ φοβεῖται στήσας ἄντικρυς ὀρκίζε·
ἔστιν δὲ ὁ ὀρκισμὸς οὗτος· ὀρκίζω
σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰη-
σοῦ· ιαβα· ιαη· αβραωθ· αἰα· θωθ·
ελε· ελω· αηω· εουῖῖ βαιεχ· αβυρ-
μας· ἱαβαραον· αβελβελ· λωνα·
αβρα· μαροια· βρακιων· πυριφανη·
ὁ ἐν μέσῃ ἀρούρης καὶ χύονος καὶ
ὀμίχλης· ταιννητις καταβάτω σου ὁ
ἄγγελος ὁ ἀπαραίτητος καὶ εἰσκρινέ-
τω τὸν περιπτάμενον δαίμονι τοῦ
πλάσματος τούτου ὃ ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεός
ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἑαυτοῦ παροδείσῳ ὅτι
ἐπείχομαι ἅγιον Θεόν. ἐπι αμμον
ψιντανχω· λόγος· ὀρκίζω σε λαβρια
ιακουθ· αβλαναθαναλβα· ακραμμ·

*Approved Method of Pi-beches for
Cases of Possession.*

Take unripe green olives, with
the plants mastigia and lotome-
tra. Boil them in an unstained
hollow vessel, repeating mean-
while the charm: Jôêl Ossar-
thiômi emôri theôchipsôith si-
themêôch sôthe iôê mimipsôthi-
ôph phersôthi acêoioûô iôê câ-
chariphtha. Go out from this
man, etc.

An amulet for the same pur-
pose. Write upon a tin-plate :
iaêô abra ôchthiôch phtha me-
sentiniâô pheôch iaêô charsok,
and bind it around the neck of
the afflicted one. Every demon
regards this as a disgrace, and
fears it. Then, placing thyself
opposite him, exorcise him, us-
ing the following formulary of
exorcism: I adjure thee by Je-
sus the God of the Jews; iaba
iaê abraôth aia thôth ele elô acô
eouiii bacch abarmas iabaran
abelbel lônâ abra maroia bra-
kiôn. Thou who dwellest in the
fire, appearing in the midst of
the field (in thunder and light-
ning?), or in the snow, and in
the clouds, cause thine angel,
Tannêtis, who will not be frus-
trated, to go down and drive
away from this creature of God,
whom God created in his holy
Paradise, the demon that has
wrapped himself around him.
Epi ammon ipsintanchô. For-
mulary: I adjure thee labra ia-
kuth ablanathanalba akramm.

λόγος· αωθ· ιαθα βαθρα· χαχθα·
 βραθα· χαμνν· ζελ· αβρωωθ· σν
 αβρασιλωθ· αλληλον· ἱε λωσαϊ· ιαηλ·
 ὀρκίζω σε τὸν σημανθέντα τῷ Ἰσ-
 ραήλ· ἐν στύλῳ φωτίνῳ καὶ νεφέλῃ
 ἡμερίνῃ καὶ ἰνυσάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸν
 λόγον ἐργοῦ Φαραώ καὶ ἐπενέγκαν-
 τα ἐπὶ Φαραῶ τὴν δεκάπληγον διὰ
 τὸν παρακούειν αὐτὸν· ὀρκίζω σε
 πᾶν πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον λαλῆσαι
 ὑποῖον καὶ ἀνῆς· ὅτι ὀρκίζω σε
 κατὰ τῆς σφραγίδος ἧς ἔθετο Σο-
 λωμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν τοῦ Ἱερη-
 μίου· καὶ ἐλάλησεν· καὶ σὺ λάλησον
 ὑποῖον ἐὰν ἦς ἐπεουράνιον ἢ ἀέριον
 εἴτε ἐπίγειον εἴτε ὑπόγειον ἢ κατα-
 χθόνιον ἢ ἐβουσαῖον ἢ χερσαῖον ἢ
 φαρισαῖον λάλησον ὑποῖον ἐὰν ἦς,
 ὅτι ὀρκίζω σε Θεὸν φωσφόρον ἀδιά-
 μαστον τὰ ἐν καρδίᾳ πάσης ζωῆς
 ἐπιστάμενοι, τὸν χοουπλάστην τοῦ
 γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸν ἐξαγα-
 γόντα ἐξ ἀδύλων καὶ πεκτοῖντα τὰ
 νέφη καὶ ὑετίζοντα τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐν-
 λογοῦντα τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς ὃν
 εὐλογεῖ πᾶσα ἐνουράνιος δύναμις
 ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων· ὀρκίζω σε
 μέγαν Θεὸν Σαβαῶθ, δι' ὃν ὁ Ἰορ-
 δάνης ποταμὸς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ

Formulary: aôth iatha bathra
 eiachithabratha chamynu zel a-
 brôôth thou art Abrasilôth alle-
 luia lôsai iaêl. I adjure thee by
 him who pointed out the way to
 Israel in a pillar of fire by night
 and in a cloud by day (Exod.
 xiii. 21), and saved Israel from
 the counsels of Pharaoh, and
 sent upon Pharaoh the ten
 plagues because he would not
 hearken unto Israel (Exod. vii.).
 I adjure thee, thou evil spirit,
 whosoever thou art, to speak,
 whatsoever language thou hast;
 for I adjure thee by the seal
 which Solomon impressed on
 the tongue of Jeremiah that he
 might speak (Jer. i. 9?). Speak
 thou, then, whatsoever speech
 thou hast, whether it be one of
 heaven, or of the air, or of the
 earth, or of the region under the
 earth, or of the lower world,
 insular, or continental, or quite
 by itself. Speak whatever sort
 of sound thou canst stutter out;
 for I adjure thee by God, who
 brings the light, the unsubdu-
 able, who knows the heart of
 every creature, who created
 mankind out of the earth, who
 gathers together and condenses
 the clouds from the unseen re-
 gions, who refreshes the earth
 with rain, who blesses its fruits,
 whom all the heavenly hosts of
 angels and archangels praise.
 I adjure thee by the mighty
 God Sabaôth, by whom the river
 Jordan was made to stand still
 (Josh. iii. 15), by whom the

ὕψω καὶ Ἐρυθρὰ θαλάσση ἡνώ-
 δευσεν Εἰσραήλ, καὶ ἔσται ἀνόθεν-
 τος· ὅτι ἐξορκίζω σε τὸν καταδεί-
 ξαντα τὰς ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα
 γλώσσας καὶ διαμερίσαντα τῷ ἰδίῳ
 προστάγματι· ὁρκίζω σε τὸν τῶν
 αἰχενίων Γιγάντων τοῖς πρηστήρσι
 καταφλέξαντα (ὄχλον), ὃν ἑννεὶ ὁ
 οὐρανὸς τῶν οὐρανῶν ὃν ἑμνοῦσι τὰ
 περυγώματα τῶν Χερουβὶν· ὁρκίζω
 σε τὸν περιθέντα ὄρη τῇ θαλάσῃ
 τεῖχος ἐξ ἄμμου καὶ ἐπιτάξαντα αὐ-
 τῇ μὴ ὑπερβῆναι καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ἡ
 ἄβυσσος καὶ σὺ ἐπάκουσον πᾶν
 πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον ὅτι ὁρκίζω σε
 τὸν συνσείοντα τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀνέ-
 μους ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν αἰώνιον οὐρα-
 νοειδῆ θαλασσοειδῆ νεφελοειδῆ· φω-
 σφόρον ἀδάμαστον· ὁρκίζω τὸν ἐν
 τῇ καθαρᾷ Ἱεροσολύμῃ ᾧ τὸ ἄσβε-
 στον πῦρ διὰ παντὸς αἰῶνος προσ-
 παράκειται τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ τῷ
 ἀγίῳ ιαεὼ βαρρενυζούν λόγος· ὃν
 τρέμει γέεννα πυρὸς καὶ φλόγες
 περιφλογίζουσιν καὶ σίδηρος λακᾶ
 καὶ πᾶν ὄρος ἐκ θεμελίου φοβεῖται·
 ὁρκίζω σε πᾶν πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον τὸν
 ἐφορῶντα ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ποιῶντα τὰ
 πάντα ἐξ ὧν οὐκ ὄντων (ἐκ τῶν οὐκ
 ὄντων) εἰς τὸ εἶναι· ὁρκίζω δὲ σε
 τὸν παραλαμβάνοντα τὸν ὁρκισμὸν

Red Sea was made to withdraw
 before Israel, and that they
 might pass over (Exod. xiv. 21).
 I adjure thee by him who sent
 down the hundred and forty
 tongues and distributed them
 according to his own pleasure
 (Acts ii. 2). I adjure thee by
 him who destroyed the mighty
 giants with his lightnings, by
 him whom heaven of heavens
 celebrates, whom the hosts of
 the Cherubim praise. I adjure
 thee by him who put limits to
 the sea, a wall of sand, and com-
 manded the waves not to over-
 flow it. As the deep hears him,
 so also, evil spirit, must thou
 hear him, whosoever thou art.
 For I adjure thee by the light-
 bringer who cannot be resisted,
 who, by the sacred æons, sends
 forth the four winds upon the
 heavens, upon the sea, and upon
 the clouds. I adjure thee by
 him who is enthroned in the
 holy Jerusalem, before whom
 through all ages the eternal fire
 burns, by his sacred name Iaco
 Barremizoun. Formulary: Be-
 fore whom the Gehenna fire
 flickers and who is surrounded
 by flames of fire, who breaks
 iron asunder and causes every
 mountain to shake to its foun-
 dation. I adjure thee, evil
 spirit, whosoever thou art, by
 him who looks upon the earth
 and who has called all things
 into existence out of nothing.
 I adjure thee who hast come
 under a solemn obligation not

τουτὸν χοίριον μὴ φαγεῖν καὶ ὑπο-
ταγῆσεται σοι πᾶν πνεῦμα καὶ δαι-
μόνιον ὑποῦν· εἰν ἦν ὀρκίζω δὲ
φύστα ἃ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄκρων (τῶν) ποδῶν
ἀφαιρῶν τὸ φύσημα εἰς τοῦ προσ-
ώπου καὶ εἰσκριθήσεται· φέλασσε
καθαρός· ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἐστὶν Ἑβραϊ-
κὸς καὶ φυλασσόμενος παρὰ καθα-
ροῖς ἀνδράσιν.

to eat swine's flesh, and every
spirit and demons of every sort
shall be subject unto thee.

Sound out the exorcism as
loudly as thou canst, blowing it
forth upon the person from his
feet to his face, and it will drive
out the demon. Keep this exor-
cism pure, for it is a Hebrew
one, and is kept by pure men
(that is, it is used by the Es-
senes).

In the Gospel according to Mark (ch. xv. 17) and in that
of Luke (ch. x. 17), and also in other passages of the New
Testament, references are made to this kind of exorcism of
demons by the name of Jesus Christ. But the long pas-
sage that we have just quoted is not the only one in the
papyrus where devils are in the name of Jesus commanded
to go forth. Here is a second example :—

Πρᾶξις γενναία ἐκβάλλουσα
δαίμονας.

*Effectual Means for Driving out
a Devil.*

λόγος λεγόμενος ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς
αὐτοῦ· βάλε ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κλω-
ρας ἐλαίας καὶ ὀπισθεν αὐτοῦ στα-
θεὶς λέγεις· χαιρε φνοῦθι ἡ
αβραὰμ χαιρε πνοῦθι ἡ ἰσακ
χαيره πνοῦτε ἡ ἰακωβ ἰησοῦς π
χρηστος πι αἰγιος ἡ πνευμα
ψιηρινφωθεσκαρηῖ ἡ ἰσααφε
εθσαχοῦν ἡ ἰσααφι ενα ἰω
σαβαωθ μαρετετενωω εωβις
αβολ απο τοῦ δεῖνα ματτεννοουο
παῖ π ακαθαρτος ἡ δαιμων π
εαδανας εοηῖωφ. ἔξορκίζω σε
δαῖμον ὅστις ποτ' οἶν εἶ κατὰ του-
τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ σαβαρβαθωθ σαβαρ-
βαθιωθ σαβαρβαρβαθωινγηθ σαβαρ-
βαρβαφαῖ ἔξελθε δαῖμον ὅστις ποτ'

Formula to be uttered over
the head of the sick: (before
him lay an olive branch, and
placing thyself behind him,
say :) Hail, spirit of Abraham;
hail spirit of Isaac, hail spirit
of Jacob, Jesus the Anointed,
the Holy, drive forth the devil
from this man, till this unclean
spirit of Satan shall flee before
thee. I adjure thee, O demon,
whoever thou art, by the God
Sabarbatthiôth Sabarbatthiuth
Sabarbarbatthiônêth Sabarbar-
baphai. Depart, O demon,
whoever thou art, at once, at

ὄν εἰ καὶ ἀπόστηθε ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίνα
 ἄρτι ἄρτι ἥδη ἔξελθε δαίμον ἐπεί σε
 δεσμεύω δεσμοῖς ἀδαμαντίνους ἀλύ-
 τοις καὶ παραδίδωμι σε εἰς τὸ μέλαν
 χάος ἐν ταῖς ἀπωλείαις.

once, without delay. Come out,
 O demon, for I shall fetter thee
 with adamantine fetters that
 will not loose, and I shall give
 thee over to utter destruction in
 black chaos.

Since the adjurations which were expressed in the Egyptian language were derived from demotic originals, we must conclude that this exorcism in the name of Jesus Christ had also been present previously in the demotic papyri.

Another passage, which presupposes acquaintance with Hebrew religious ideas, runs as follows:—

ἐγὼ εἰμι Μωϋσῆς ὁ προφήτης σου
 ᾧ παρέδωκας τὰ μυστήρια σου τὰ
 συντελούμενα Ἰσραὴλ· σὺν ἔδειξας
 ὑγρὸν καὶ ξηρὸν καὶ πᾶσαν τροφὴν
 ἐπάκουσον μου· ἐγὼ εἰμι ἄγγελος
 τοῦ Φαπρω Οσοροννωφρις τοῦτο
 ἐστίν σου τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀληθινὸν τὸ
 παραδιδόμενον τοῖς προφήταις Ἰσ-
 ραὴλ ἐπάκουσον μου Ἀρβαθιαω
 ρειβετ atheleβερσηθ αβ . . βλαθα
 αλβεν εβενφι χιταγοη ιβ . . . θιαω
 εἰσακουσόν μου καὶ ἀπόστρεψον τὸ
 δαιμόνιον τοῦτο ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε,
 etc.

εἰσάκουσον μου τῆς φωνῆς ἐπι-
 καλοῦμαι σε τὸν δυνάστην τῶν θεῶν
 ὑψιβρεμέτα Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τύραννε Ἀδω-
 ναι κύριε ιαωουηε ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐπικα-
 λουμεῖός σε συριστὶ θεὸν μέγαν
 Ζααλαηριφφου καὶ σὺ μὴ παρακού-
 σης τῆς φωνῆς Ἐβραῖστὶ αβλανα-
 θαναλβα αβρασιλωα ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι

I am [says the soothsayer],
 Moses thy prophet, to whom
 thou hast confided thy myste-
 ries, in which Israel should take
 part. Thou hast pointed out
 the dry and the wet and all sus-
 tenance. Hear me: I am the
 angel of Phaprō Ossoronno-
 phris. This is thy true name,
 which has been given over to
 the prophets of Israel. Hear
 me: Arbathiaō reibet atheleber-
 sēth ab(lanathanalba) ebenphi
 chitagoē ib . . . thiaō. Hear
 me, and cast those demons out.
 I call on thee, etc.

Listen to my voice. I cry
 unto thee, thou ruler of the gods,
 loud-thundering Zeus, Zeus
 the Sovereign Ruler, Adōnai,
 Lord, Iadōnee. I am he who
 calls upon thee in the Syrian
 tongue under the name of the
 great god Zaalaēriphphon; and
 thou, who art called in the He-
 brew tongue Ablanathanalba
 Abrasilōa, let not my voice re-

σελθαχωνυχ λαιλαμ βαασαλωθ'ιαω
 ιεω νεβονθ σαβιοθαρβωθ αρβαθιαω
 ιαωθ σαβαωθ πατορρη ζαγορρη βα-
 ρονχ αδωναι ελωαι ιαβρααρ.

ὅτι ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τῆς Ἑβραϊ-
 κῆς φωνῆς ἢ κατὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης τῶν
 ἀναγκῶν μασκελλιμασκελλῶ.

τέχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων νεβουτο-
 σοναληθ ιωῖ λοιμουλαλον συνριστί
 η ταρονκον βινθουπνουσαν καθινβε-
 ραο εστοχεθ ορένθα αμελχερι βιονθ
 σφρουθ.

φυλακτήριον πρὸς δαιμονιζόμε-
 ρους . . .

παῖδα στῆσον καταντικρὺ τοῦ
 ἡλίου καὶ λέγε τὸν λόγον κατόπιν
 αὐτοῦ στὰς ἀκ βαρβαριωθ βαρβα-
 ριωθ ἀκ πεσκοιτ εἶαζω αδωναι
 ελωαι σαβαωθ.

ἐξορκίζω (ύμᾱς) κατὰ τοῦ Ἰάω
 καὶ τοῦ Σαβαωθ καὶ Ἀδωναί, etc.

ἐξορκίζω σε σμύρνα κατὰ τῶν
 τριῶν ὀνομάτων ανοχω αβρασαξ
 τρω καὶ τὸν ἐπακολουθύτερον καὶ
 τὸν ὑσχυρότερον κορμειωθ ιαω σα-
 βαωθ αδωναι.

ὀρκίσας σε καὶ νῦν ὀρκίζω σε
 αδωναι βαρβαριωω ζαγορρη αρσα-
 μωσι αλαους καισαλαως ὀρκίζω σε
 τὸν στηρίζοντα ἄνθρωπον εἰς ζωὴν
 ἄκουε ἄκουε ὁ μέγας θεὸς Ἀδωναί.

ἐξορκίζω σαι ιαω σαβαωθ αδωναι
 αβρασαξ.

ποιήσον μοι τὸ δεῖνα πρᾶγμα ὅτι
 ἐνείχομαι σοι κατὰ τοῦ Ἰαω θεοῦ

main unheard. For I am Sil-
 thachonch Lailam Baasalôth Iaô
 Ieô Nebonth Sabiotharbôth Ar-
 bathiaô Ieôth Sabaôth Patourê
 Zagourê Baronch Adônai Elôai
 Iabraam.

I adjure thee in the Hebrew
 tongue, or by the most compel-
 ling of all compelling influences,
 Maskellimaskellô.

*Amulet to protect from Demo-
 niacal Possession . . .*

Let a boy, standing before the
 sun, and placing thyself behind
 him, repeat this formula: I am
 Barbariôth, Barbariôth am I
 . . . Adônai Elôai Sabaôth.

I exorcise you in the name
 of Iaô and of Sabaôth and of
 Adônai.

I exorcise thee, O myrrh, by
 the three names: Anochô, Abra-
 sax, Trô, and by the yet more
 effective and powerful exorcism
 Kormeioth Iaô Sabaôth Adônai.

As I have always adjured
 thee, I adjure thee now, Adônai
 Barbariaô Zagourê Arsamôsi
 Alaons Kaisalaôs. I adjure
 thee, thou who didst give life
 to man! Hear, hear, O great
 God, Adônai.

I adjure thee, Iaô, Adônai,
 Abrasax.

Do for me this and that thing,
 for I adjure thee by Iaô, by the

Σαβαὼθ θεοῦ Ἀδωναί θεοῦ Μιχαήλ
θεοῦ Σουριήλ θεοῦ Γαβριήλ θεοῦ
Ραφαήλ θεοῦ Ἀβρασασξ θεοῦ αβλα-
ναθανάλβα ακραμμαχαρι.

καὶ ὁ ἐπάνω καθήμενος Μιχαήλ
ἐπὶ τὰ ὑδάτων κρατεῖς καὶ γῆς καὶ
σκοον ὃν καλέουσι δράκοντα μέγαν
ακροκοδηρε μουιερωι χαρχαρ αδωναι
ζεϋ δη δαμναμενεϋ κυνοβιονεξαγγρα.

(γράφει) ὑπακάτω δὲ τοῦ Ἑρωτος
τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα αχαπα αδωναιε
βασμα χαρακω ιακωβ ιαωη φαρφα-
ρηϊ εἰς δὲ το ἑτερον μερος, etc.

κρύφιε καὶ πρεσβύτατε αχαπα
αδωναιε βασμα χαρακω ιακωβ ιαω
χαρουηρ αρουηρ λαϊλαμ σεμεσιλαμ
σουμαρτα μαρβα καρβα μεναβωθ
ηια.

(γράφει) ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πελμάτων
τοῦ μὲν δεξιῶν ελω τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου
ελωαιος.

εἰς δὲ πέταλον χρυσοῦν τὸ ξίφος
τοῦτο γράφει εἰς θουριηλ μιχαηλ
γαβριηλ ουριηλ μισαηλ ισραηλ
ιστραηλ.

ὀρκίζω σε ἱερὸν φῶς ἱερὰ αὐγὴ
. . κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων ὀνομάτων τῶν
εἶρηκα καὶ νῦν μέλλω λέγειν κατὰ
τοῦ ιαω σαβαωθ αρβαθιω σεσεν-
γενβαρφαρυγγης αβλαναθανάλβα
ακραμμαχαμαρι.

ἐπικαλοῦμαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους μεγαλο-
δυνάμους μεγαλοδόξους μεγασθενεῖς
ἁγίους αὐτόχθονας παρέδρους τοῦ
μεγάλου θεοῦ . . αωθ αβαωθ βα-
συμ ισακ σαβαωθ ιαω ιακωπ.

God Sabaôth, by the God Ado-
nai, by the God Michael, by the
God Snriel, by the God Gabriel,
by the God Raphael, by the God
Abrasax, by the God Ablana-
thanalba akrammachari.

And Michael, throned in glory,
thou hast power over the seven
streams, over the earth, and over
the Prince of Darkness, whom
men call the great serpent, etc.

Write under Eros these
names: Achapa Adônai basma
charako, Jacôb, iaôê Pharparei:
on the other side, etc.

Thou hidden and most ancient
One, Achapa Adônai basma cha-
rakô Iacôb iaô charonêr arouêr
lailam semesilam sonmarta mar-
ba karba menabôth êia.

Write upon thy right heel,
Elô, and upon thy left, Elôaios.

Write on a golden plate the
following: There is but one
Thnriel Michael Gabriel Uriel
Misael Israel Istraël.

I adjure thee holy light, sa-
cred gleam, by the sacred names,
which I have named and now
will name, by Iaô Sabaôth Ar-
bathiaô, Sesengenbarpharangês
Ablanathanalba Akrammachamari.

I call upon you, ye saints,
powerful, restful, mighty, holy
fellow-citizens by right of birth
with the great God . . . aôth
Abaôth Basum Isak Sabaôth Iaô
Iacôp.

αὐτογενέτορ ἀείζων θεέ εἰωη ιαω
 αιω αιω φνεως σφιντης αρβαθιαω
 ιαω ιαη ιωα αιωων ουηρ γονθιαωρ
 ραραηλ αβραβραχα σοροορμερφερ-
 γαρ μαρβαφριονῆριγξ ιαω σαβαωθ
 μασκελλιμασκελλω. ὁ λόγος.

τελει μοι Μιχαὴλ ἀγγέλων ἀρ-
 χάγγελε.

Vienna.

Self-created eternal God, eîôê
 iaô aiô aiô phneôs sphintês ar-
 bathiaô iaô iaê iôa aioôn uôr
 gonthiaôr rariêl abrabracha so-
 roormerpher gar marbaphriouir-
 rinx iaô Sabaôth Maskellimas-
 kellô. Formula.

Help me, Michael, archangel
 over the angels.

K. WESSELY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XX.

THE GARMENTS OF THE RENEWED SOUL.

"Put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any; even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye: and above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness."—COL. iii. 12-14 (Rev. Ver.).

WE need not repeat what has been already said as to the logic of the inference, You have put off the "old man," therefore put off the vices which belong to him. Here we have the same argument in reference to the "new man" who is to be "put on" because he has been put on. This "therefore" rests the exhortation both on that thought, and on the nearer words, "Christ is all and in all." Because the new nature has been assumed in the very act of conversion, therefore array your souls in vesture corresponding. Because Christ is all and in all, therefore clothe yourselves with all brotherly graces, corresponding to the great unity into which all Christians are brought by their common possession of Christ. The whole field of Christian morality is not traversed here, but only so much of it as concerns the social duties which result from that unity.

But besides the foundation for the exhortations which is laid in the possession of the New Man, consequent on participation in Christ, another ground for them is added in the words, "as God's elect, holy and beloved." Those who are in Christ, and are thus regenerated in Him, are of the chosen race, are consecrated as belonging especially to God, and receive the warm beams of the special paternal love with which He regards the men who are in some measure conformed to His likeness and moulded after His will. That relation to God should draw after it a life congruous with itself—a life of active goodness and brotherly gentleness. The outcome of it should be not mere glad emotion, nor a hugging of one's self in one's happiness, but practical efforts to turn to men a face lit by the same dispositions with which God has looked on us, or as the parallel passage in Ephesians has it, "Be imitators of God, as beloved children." That is a wide and fruitful principle—the relation to men will follow the relation to God. As we think God has been to us, so let us try to be to others. The poorest little fishing cobble is best guided by celestial observations, and dead reckoning without sun or stars is but second best. Independent morality cut loose from religion will be feeble morality. On the other hand, religion which does not issue in morality is a ghost without substance. Religion is the soul of morality. Morality is the body of religion, more than ceremonial worship is. The virtues which all men know, are the fitting garments of the elect of God.

I. We have here then an enumeration of the fair garments of the new man.

Let us go over the items of this list of the wardrobe of the consecrated soul.

"A heart of compassion." So the Revised Version renders the words given literally in the Authorised as "bowels of mercies," an expression which that very strange thing

called conventional propriety regards as coarse, simply because Jews chose one part of the body and we another as the supposed seat of the emotions. Either phrase expresses substantially the Apostle's meaning.

Is it not beautiful that the series should begin with *pity*? It is the most often needed, for the sea of sorrow stretches so widely that nothing less than a universal compassion can arch it over as with the blue of heaven. Every man would seem in some respect deserving of and needing sympathy, if his whole heart and history could be laid bare. Such compassion is difficult to achieve, for the healing streams of our pity are dammed back by many obstructions of inattention and occupation, and dried up by the fierce heat of selfishness. Custom, with its deadening influence, comes in to make us feel least the sorrows which are most common in the society around us. As a man might live so long in an asylum that lunacy would seem to him almost the normal conditions, so the most widely diffused griefs are those least observed and least compassionated; and good, tender-hearted men and women walk the streets of our great cities and see sights—children growing up for the gallows and the devil, gin-shops at every corner—which might make angels weep, and suppose them to be as inseparable from our “civilization” as the noise of wheels from a carriage or bilge water from a ship. Therefore we have to make conscious efforts to “put on” that sympathetic disposition, and to fight against the faults which hinder its free play. No other help will be of much use to the receiver, nor of any to the giver. Benefits bestowed on the needy and sorrowful, if bestowed without sympathy, will hurt like a blow. Much is said about ingratitude, but very often it is but the instinctive recoil of the heart from the unkind doer of a kindness. Aid flung to a man as a bone is to a dog usually gets as much gratitude as the sympathy which it expresses deserves. But if we really make another's sorrows

ours, that teaches us tact and gentleness, and makes our clumsy hands light and deft to bind up sore hearts.

Above all things, the practical discipline which cultivates pity will beware of letting it be excited and then not allowing the emotion to act. To stimulate feeling and do nothing in consequence is a short road to destroy the feeling. Pity is meant to be the impulse toward help, and if it is checked and suffered to pass away idly, it is weakened as certainly as a plant is weakened by being kept close nipped and hindered from bringing its buds to flower and fruit.

“Kindness” comes next—a wider benignity, not only exercised where there is manifest room for pity, but turning a face of goodwill to all. Some souls are so dowered that they have this grace without effort, and come like the sunshine with welcome and cheer for all the world. But even less happily endowed natures can cultivate the disposition, and the best way to cultivate it is to be much in communion with God. When Moses came down from the mount, his face shone. When we come out from the secret place of the Most High we shall bear some reflection of His great kindness whose “tender mercies are over all His works.” This “kindness” is the opposite of that worldly wisdom, on which many men pride themselves as the ripe fruit of their knowledge of men and things, and which keeps up vigilant suspicion of everybody, as in the savage state, where “stranger” and “enemy” had only one word between them. It does not require us to be blind to facts or to live in fancies, but it does require us to cherish a habit of goodwill, ready to become pity if sorrow appears, and slow to turn away even if hostility appears. Meet your brother with that, and you will generally find it returned. The prudent hypocrites who get on in the world, as ships are launched, by “greasing the ways” with flattery, and by a perpetual smile, teach us the value of the true thing,

since even a coarse caricature of it wins hearts and disarms foes. This "kindness" is the most powerful solvent of ill-will and indifference.

Then follows "humility." That seems to break the current of thought by bringing a virtue so entirely occupied with self into the middle of a series referring exclusively to others. But it does not really do so. From this point onwards all the graces named have reference to our demeanour under slights and injuries—and humility comes into view here only as constituting the foundation for the right bearing of these. Meekness and longsuffering must stand on a basis of humility. The proud man, who thinks highly of himself and of his own claims, will be the touchy man, if any one derogates from these.

"Humility," or lowly-mindedness, a lowly estimate of ourselves, is not necessarily blindness to our strong points. If a man can do certain things better than his neighbours, he can hardly help knowing it, and Christian humility does not require him to be ignorant of it. I suppose Milton would be none the less humble, though he was quite sure that his work was better than that of Sternhold and Hopkins. The consciousness of power usually accompanies power. But though it may be quite right to "know myself" in the strong points, as well as in the weak, there are two considerations which should act as dampers to any unchristian fire of pride which the devil's breath may blow up from that fuel. The one is, "What hast thou that thou hast not received?" the other is, "Who is pure before God's judgment-seat?" Your strong points are nothing so very wonderful, after all. If you have better brains than some of your neighbours, well, that is not a thing to give yourself such airs about—and besides, where did you get the faculties you plume yourself on? however cultivated by yourself, how came they yours at first? And, furthermore, whatever superiorities may lift you above any men, and however high

above them you may be elevated, it is a long way from the top of the highest molehill to the sun, and not much longer to the top of the lowest. And, besides all that, you may be very clever and brilliant, may have made books or pictures, may have stamped your name on some invention, may have won a place in public life, or made a fortune—and yet you and the beggar who cannot write his name are both sinners before God. Pride seems out of place in creatures like us, who have all to bow our heads in the presence of His perfect judgment, and cry, “God be merciful to me a sinner!”

Then follow “meekness, long-suffering.” The distinction between these two is slight. According to the most thorough investigators, the former is the temper which accepts God’s dealings, or evil inflicted by men as His instruments, without resistance, while the latter is the long holding out of the mind before it gives way to a temptation, to action, or passion, especially the latter. The opposite of meekness is rudeness or harshness; the opposite of long-suffering, resentment or revenge. Perhaps there may be something in the distinction, that while long-suffering does not get angry soon, meekness does not get angry at all. Possibly, too, meekness implies a lowlier position than long-suffering does. The meek man puts himself below the offender; the long-suffering man does not. God is long-suffering, but the incarnate God alone can be “meek and lowly.”

The general meaning is plain enough. The “hate of hate,” the “scorn of scorn,” is not the Christian ideal. I am not to allow my enemy always to settle the terms on which we are to be. Why should I scowl back at him, though he frowns at me? It is hard work, as we all know, to repress the retort that would wound and be so neat. It is hard not to repay slights and offences in kind. But, if the basis of our dispositions to others be laid in a wise and lowly estimate of ourselves, such graces of conduct will be possible, and they will give beauty to our characters.

“Forbearing and forgiving” are not new virtues. They are meekness and long-suffering in exercise, and if we were right in saying that “long-suffering” was not *soon* angry, and “meekness” was not angry at all, then “forbearance” would correspond to the former, and “forgiveness” to the latter; for a man may exercise forbearance, and bite his lips till the blood come rather than speak, and violently constrain himself to keep calm and do nothing unkind, and yet all the while seven devils may be in his heart; while forgiveness, on the other hand, is an entire wiping of all enmity and irritation clean out of the heart.

Such is the Apostle’s outline sketch of the Christian character in its social aspect, all rooted in pity, and full of soft compassion; quick to apprehend, to feel, and to succour sorrow; a kindliness, equable and widespread, illuminating all who come within its reach; a patient acceptance of wrongs without resentment or revenge, because a lowly judgment of self and its claims, a spirit schooled to calmness under all provocations, disdaining to requite wrong by wrong, and quick to forgive.

The question may well be asked—is that a type of character which the world generally admires? Is it not uncommonly like what most people would call “a poor spiritless creature.” It was “a new man,” most emphatically, when Paul drew that sketch, for the heathen world had never seen anything like it. It is a “new man” still; for although the modern world has had some kind of Christianity—at least has had a Church—for all these centuries, that is not the kind of character which is its ideal. Look at the heroes of history and of literature. Look at the tone of so much contemporary biography and criticism of public actions. Think of the ridicule which is poured on the attempt to regulate politics by Christian principles, or, as a distinguished soldier called them in public recently, “puling principles.” It may be true that Christianity has not

added any new virtues to those which are prescribed by natural conscience, but it has most certainly altered the perspective of the whole, and created a type of excellence, in which the gentler virtues predominate, and the novelty of which is proved by the reluctance of the so-called Christian world to recognise it even yet.

By the side of its serene and lofty beauty, the "heroic virtues" embodied in the world's type of excellence show vulgar and glaring, like some daub representing a soldier, the sign-post of a public-house, by the side of Angelico's white-robed visions on the still convent walls. The highest exercise of these more gaudy and conspicuous qualities is to produce the pity and meekness of the Christian ideal. More self-command, more heroic firmness, more contempt for the popular estimate, more of everything strong and manly, will find a nobler field in subduing passion and cherishing forgiveness, which the world thinks folly and spiritless, than anywhere else. Better is he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.

The great pattern and motive of forgiveness is next set forth. We are to forgive as Christ has forgiven us; and that "as" may be applied either as meaning "in like manner," or as meaning "because." The Revised Version, with many others, adopts the various reading of "the Lord," instead of "Christ," which has the advantage of recalling the parable that was no doubt in Paul's mind, about the servant who, having been forgiven by his "*Lord*" all his great debt, took his fellow-servant by the throat and squeezed the last farthing out of him.

The great transcendent act of God's mercy brought to us by Christ's cross is sometimes, as in the parallel passage in Ephesians, spoken of as "God for Christ's sake forgiving us," and sometimes as here, Christ is represented as forgiving. We need not pause to do more than point to that interchange of Divine office and attributes, and ask what notion of Christ's person underlies it.

We have already had the death of Christ set forth as in a very profound sense our pattern. Here we have one special case of the general law that the life and death of our Lord are the embodied ideal of human character and conduct. His forgiveness is not merely revealed to us that trembling hearts may be calm, and that a fearful looking for of judgment may no more trouble a foreboding conscience. But whilst we must ever begin with cleaving to it as our hope, we must never stop there. A heart touched and softened by pardon will be a heart apt to pardon, and the miracle of meekness which has been wrought for it will constitute the law of its life as well as the ground of its joyful security.

This new pattern and new motive, both in one, make the true novelty and specific difference of Christian morality. "As I have loved you," makes the commandment "love one another" a new commandment. And all that is difficult in obedience becomes easier by the power of that motive. Imitation of one whom we love is instinctive. Obedience to one whom we love is delightful. The far off ideal becomes near and real in the person of our best friend. Bound to him by obligations so immense, and a forgiveness so costly and complete, we shall joyfully yield to "the cords of love" which draw us after Him. We have each to choose what shall be the pattern for us. The world takes Cæsar, the hero; the Christian takes Christ, in whose meekness is power, and whose gentle long-suffering has been victor in a sterner conflict than any battle of the warrior with garments rolled in blood.

Paul says, "Even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye." The Lord's prayer teaches us to ask, Forgive us our trespasses, as we also forgive. In the one case Christ's forgiveness is the example and the motive for ours. In the other, our forgiveness is the condition of God's. Both are true. We shall find the strongest impulse to pardon others

in the consciousness that we have been pardoned by Him. And if we have grudgings against our offending brother in our hearts, we shall not be conscious of the tender forgiveness of our Father in heaven. That is no arbitrary limitation, but inherent in the very nature of the case.

II. We have here the girdle which keeps all the garments in their places.

"Above all these things, put on love, which is the bond of perfectness."

"Above all these" does not mean "besides," or "more important than," but is clearly used in its simplest local sense, as equivalent to "over," and thus carries on the metaphor of the dress. Over the other garments is to be put the silken sash or girdle of love, which will brace and confine all the rest into a unity. It is "the girdle of perfectness," by which is not meant, as is often supposed, the perfect principle of union among men. Perfectness is not the quality of the girdle, but the thing which it girds, and is a collective expression for "the various graces and virtues, which together make up perfection." So the metaphor expresses the thought that love knits into a harmonious whole, the graces which without it would be fragmentary and incomplete.

We can conceive of all the dispositions already named as existing in some fashion without love. There might be pity which was not love, though we know it is akin to it. The feeling with which one looks upon some poor outcast, or on some stranger in sorrow, or even on an enemy in misery, may be very genuine compassion, and yet clearly separate from love. So with all the others. There may be kindness most real without any of the diviner emotion, and there may even be forbearance reaching up to forgiveness, and yet leaving the heart untouched in its deepest recesses. But if these virtues were thus exercised, in the absence of love they would be frag-

mentary, shallow, and would have no guarantee for their own continuance. Let love come into the heart and knit a man to the poor creature whom he had only pitied before, or to the enemy whom he had at the most been able with an effort to forgive, and it lifts these other emotions into a nobler life. He who pities may not love, but he who loves cannot but pity; and that compassion will flow with a deeper current and be of a purer quality than the shrunken stream which does not rise from that higher source.

Nor is it only the virtues enumerated here for which love performs this office; but all the else isolated graces of character, it binds or welds into a harmonious whole. As the broad Eastern girdle holds the flowing robes in position, and gives needed firmness to the figure as well as composed order to the attire; so this broad band, woven of softest fabric, keeps all emotions in their due place and makes the attire of the Christian soul beautiful in harmonious completeness.

Perhaps it is a yet deeper truth that love produces all these graces. Whatsoever things men call virtues, are best cultivated by cultivating it. So with a somewhat similar meaning to that of our text, but if anything, going deeper down, Paul in another place calls love the fulfilling of the law, even as his Master had taught him that all the complex of duties incumbent upon us were summed up in the love to God, and love to men. Whatever I owe to my brother will be discharged if I love God, and live my love. Nothing of it, not even the smallest mite of the debt will be discharged, however vast my sacrifices and services, if I do not.

So end the frequent references in this letter to putting off the old and putting on the new. The sum of them all is, that we must first put on Christ by faith, and then by daily effort clothe our spirits in the graces of character which He gives us, and by which we shall be like Him.

We have said that this dress of the Christian soul which we have been considering now, does not include the whole of Christian duty. We may recall the other application of the same figure which occurs in the parallel Epistle to the Ephesians, where Paul sketches for us in a few rapid touches the armed Christian soldier. The two pictures may profitably be set side by side. Here he dresses the Christian soul in the robes of peace, bidding him put on pity and meekness, and, above all the silken girdle of love.

“In peace, there’s nothing so becomes a man,
As modest stillness and humility;
But when the blast of war blows in our ears,”

then “put on the whole armour of God,” the leathern girdle of truth, the shining breastplate of righteousness, and above all, the shield of faith—and so stand a flashing pillar of steel. Are the two pictures inconsistent? must we doff the robes of peace to don the armour, or put off the armour to resume the robes of peace? Not so; both must be worn together, for neither is found in its completeness without the other. Beneath the armour must be the fine linen, clean and white—and at one and the same time, our souls may be clad in all pity, mercifulness and love, and in all the sparkling panoply of courage and strength for battle.

But both the armour and the dress of peace presuppose that we have listened to Christ’s pleading counsel to buy of Him “white raiment that we may be clothed, and that the shame of our nakedness do not appear.” The garment for the soul, which is to hide its deformities and to replace our own filthy rags, is woven in no earthly looms, and no efforts of ours will bring us into possession of it. We must be content to owe it wholly to Christ’s gift, or else we shall have to go without it altogether. The first step in the Christian life is by simple faith to receive from

Him the forgiveness of all our sins, and that new nature which He alone can impart, and which we can neither create nor win, but must simply accept. Then, after that, come the field and the time for our efforts put forth in His strength, to array our souls in His likeness, and day by day to put on the beautiful garments which He bestows. It is a lifelong work thus to strip ourselves of the rags of our old vices, and to gird on the robe of righteousness. Lofty encouragements, tender motives, solemn warnings, all point to this as our continual task. We should set ourselves to it in His strength, if so be that being clothed, we may not be found naked—and then, when we lay aside the garment of flesh and the armour needed for the battle, we shall hear His voice welcoming us to the land of peace, and shall walk with Him in victor's robes, glistening “so as no fuller on earth could white them.”

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

V. RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES.—CHAP. VII. VIII.

For two years Zechariah saw no visions. Nothing came into his mind which he could honestly communicate to the people as a fresh word of God. To those who enjoyed his visions and waited for them more impatiently than we wait for an important speech from a leading statesman or a new poem of the Laureate, this was disappointing; and strong pressure must have been put upon the prophet to discharge his function. Matters were all the while emerging which it was a strong temptation to decide by an oracular utterance. Questions must often have been put to Zechariah concerning affairs of which he had his own private opinion, and he would not have been human had

he never been tempted to utter this as if it were authoritative; but Zechariah seems to have been an honest man, and a man whose honesty cleared his inward sight so that he could not mistake what was God's voice in him for his own imaginings or opinions. The people must, therefore, have gradually come to understand that prophecy was of no private instigation or the mere imaginings of the individual prophet, but that the prophet was then only a prophet when he spoke as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

At length after two years of silence Zechariah was thus moved to speak. The men of Bethel sent a deputation to Jerusalem, to enquire of the priests and prophets whether it was advisable to continue the Fast in the fifth month. This fast had been appointed to commemorate and bewail the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, who in this month "burnt the house of the Lord, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house he burnt with fire," so that from the seventh to the tenth of the month the city was all in flames. It suddenly struck the men of Bethel that this fast was out of place now, when the city and temple were daily assuming more promising proportions. They were intelligent and honest men, who felt that a religious service which did not express present feelings, but was a mere antiquated observance, was worse than useless. At the same time they had too much respect for ecclesiastical authority to take upon themselves to abolish the fast-day. And besides, they had as much patriotic feeling as forbade them to move in this matter irrespective of their fellow-citizens and of the ideas that might prevail in other towns.

The answer to their question expresses some essential principles of religious service: 1. That it is reasonable to revise continually all our religious observances, with a view to ascertain if there still remains the same reason for their

continuance as there was for their institution. The Jews, in common with Eastern nations generally, were excessively bound by tradition. Yet these men of Bethel suddenly awoke to the absurdity of wearing sackcloth and casting ashes on their heads in mourning for a city which every day was becoming more beautiful and prosperous. They felt that they were false, exhibiting a grief which had long since passed away. The lamentation and confession which were most appropriate while the people were in banishment, were out of place now that they were restored to their land. The course of time, the progress of events, had antiquated this fast.

And it is always a reasonable and necessary question to put regarding every religious observance which has had an incidental origin, whether it is not now antiquated and an encumbrance; whether what was most appropriate a hundred years ago is not inappropriate and mischievous now; whether what God appointed for the last generation He may not desire to abolish in this. In our religious observances there is what is essential and unchangeable. That Christians should meet together to worship the Father and to encourage one another in the faith, that they should celebrate Baptism and the Communion, these are necessities of the Christian life, and are of perpetual obligation. But those observances which at one time did not exist in the Church, but were suggested by some special occasion or particular need or emergency, may become obsolete. The need may pass away, the occasion lose all its urgency by lapse of time, and it is therefore the duty of the Church to enquire and determine whether the observance should or should not be continued. Forms of worship which were adopted during the reaction against Popery become inane when the Church's danger lies in another direction. Fasts and feasts which were heartily instituted by men whose feeling was stirred by great calamities or by valuable

benefits, become meaningless burdens when the events are overlaid by matters of greater present consequence. Revision, therefore, of all observances and forms of worship is one of the standing duties of a Church.

But the men of Bethel must be imitated not only in their inquiry, but in their manner of making it. They recognised the importance of unanimity and of submission to authority. They did not abolish the Fast in Bethel and leave Jerusalem to follow suit. And their moderation was rewarded. They had the satisfaction of carrying the whole Church with them. Moved by two balancing principles, respect for authority and the exercise of private judgment, they proposed their question.

2. The answer they received was not direct. The best answer, the only sufficient answer, to religious inquiry is often indirect. Men wish for rules, God gives them principles out of which they can frame rules for themselves. Men ask for superficial instruction: God penetrates to the root of their difficulties. In this instance the reply virtually was: "There is no need of saying *when* you should fast, unless you first of all know what true fasting is. There is no call for any new deliverances on the subject. If you ponder what has already been said by the former prophets, you will be able to determine this point for yourselves." This is a rebuke administered to the frame of mind that craves special and infallible guidance in matters regarding which the mind of God has already been sufficiently indicated. This frame of mind has two roots. The one is a disinclination to act in the manner which has already been identified as coincident with God's will. Men profess to be seeking for more light; but they are really seeking for something which may dim and darken the light they have, and allow them to be doubtful whether they should make the sacrifice or do the duty demanded of them. And when in this frame of mind, asking for more light because already they see

too clearly for their own comfort what their duty is, they are always unusually sanctimonious, and redundantly rich in religious expressions and ostentatiously earnest in consulting every one who can advise them. The other root of this disposition is a timorous distrust of one's own judgment. Even in men who have some experience of religion, there remains an unworthy fear of God, which causes them to shrink from carrying out their own conclusions in matters of religion. Men act as if God might be angry with them for using the judgment He Himself has implanted in them, as the chief instrument of their education and progress.

3. The answer to these men of Bethel cautions us especially against a self-interested observance of religious ordinances. "When ye fasted and mourned, did ye at all fast unto Me?" Frequently men engage in religious ordinances because they have a dim expectation of some good that is thereby to accrue to them. These observances of theirs are not the spontaneous outpouring of souls that love God, and worship because they are inwardly rapt and adoring. Self-interested worship may be much more elaborate than that of the sincere worshipper. The flatterer who has an end to gain will word his address to you in much more elaborate phrase than the friend who speaks direct from the heart. But of such flattery you say, with God, "I cannot away with it." To these men of Bethel, and through them to all formal worshippers, God says: Why consult Me about these services? What have I to do with them? It was not Me you had in view, but yourselves, in performing them. If you like them, continue them. If they are a weariness to you, how much more to Me. So long as you merely wish to please yourselves, or to secure yourselves against some imagined danger, devise whatever services you think will best suit yourselves.

Our whole idea of religious service, then, is wrong if it

proceeds mainly from an expectation that good will thereby accrue to ourselves. If we sing God's praise under the impression that this is required of us and that we must do it, God meets us with, Who has required this of you? Nothing can be more intolerable and repulsive to Him than such fictitious homage. What He seeks is the outpouring of the full heart that delights in Him and cannot forbear praising, or at all events finds real satisfaction in doing so. When the worship of God becomes to us a mere duty the performance of which we feel incumbent upon us that we may not lose God's favour; when we enter upon it without heart, or even with some repugnance or distaste, God cannot recognise that as worship of Him, but only as the service of our own superstitious and ignorant self-seeking. We seek the company of our friends, not that we may ingratiate ourselves with them, but because we are happier there than elsewhere; such is the worship which God delights in.

4. Of fasting itself our ideas are apt to be confused. On the whole we are perhaps too ready to dismiss it as a mere old-fashioned or monkish observance. But certainly, both in the Old and New Testament, some importance is attached to it. And naturally enough, we begin to fear lest in parting with fasting we may also be parting with some spiritual benefits which fasting communicated. Now what fasting does is, first, to bring our acknowledgment of sin, and our humiliation on account of it, into a distinct bodily form. We confess sin not only by word of mouth, but by act, by abstinence. We allow this fact of our sinfulness to regulate our bodily condition. We take so much account of it, and ascribe so much reality to it, as to allow it to appear in and to sway our outward demeanour. Men who have felt their sin deeply have not taken to fasting as a right thing to do. They have been driven to it. As a heart bleeding from bereavement cannot

turn to food as if there were the same charm in living as ever; so those in whose conscience sin has been asserting its importance, cannot but turn from the world and from their usual pursuits and nourishment in extreme bitterness of spirit. "My *sin* is ever before me."

It will, however, be said, Well then, let those who are thus driven to fasting, fast, but do not ask it of men who have no such feeling about their sin, who can eat and drink and go about their usual employments with gusto and relish, whose appetite has never been spoiled by sorrow for sin, whatever else may have interfered with it. But I am not sure that this is sound reasoning. For even where fasting is not the natural expression of sorrow for sin it may produce a state of mind in which the evil of sin is more truly appreciated. Many whose natural grief is so slight that it would never dictate to them to clothe themselves in mourning, have their grief increased when they conform to the usual custom. And those whose grief is bitter find it increased by funereal gloom and all the sad appurtenances of woe. So any little grief we have for sin might be materially aided by what has been in some its natural expression.

It is to be feared that at the bottom of the modern shrinking from fasting lies the feeling that to fast for sin is making rather too much of it, and so giving it a prominence and substantial recognition in our lives which is exaggerated and unseemly. We are willing to acknowledge sin and ask forgiveness, but to prolong our humiliation and allow a spiritual concern to put aside any ordinary arrangement of our life, is going too far. If so, it is a most unreasonable superiority with which we presume to look down upon those true souls who have so keenly felt their sin as to mourn for it as truly as ever they grieved over an earthly loss. They were at least in earnest. And whether we fast or fast not, it is essential that we have

that genuine grief for sin which in other days produced, and in other men produces, fasting as its natural expression. If we see sin to be the root of evil, this perception will find expression in our lives, if not in fasting, then in some outward result as distinctly perceptible.

But fasting has a second function. It is an unmistakable expression of willingness to abstain from whatever might serve as fuel to sinful passion, and to reduce the spirit to a chastened and humble frame. Paul himself was careful to "keep his body under." So far from allowing it comforts and pampering it with indulgences, he used severity towards it. And when one reads of men who have followed his example, the question always arises: Did these men know less about the means of resisting sin than we do, or did they know more of the inveteracy and danger of sin? Were they more ignorant or more in earnest? This at least is obvious, that they were willing to do what they could towards destroying sin, no matter what uncomfortable lives they had to lead in consequence. They showed a determination to be holy; a determination that the spirit should be the absolute master of the body, and should not be prevented from communing with God even by what might seem the most necessary occupations. And whether by fasting or by other methods, we also must gain this mastery over the body, this superiority to such considerations as the flesh suggests. If we cannot bear to forego accustomed comforts, if we cannot step aside from familiar ways, if we fear to give the spirit final and complete advantage over the flesh, we have not the temper of those who fast. Yet without this temper we hope in vain for sanctification. Without times of true spiritual exaltation, and of detachment from bodily cravings and appetites, we cannot attain any high measure of holiness. If there is a degree of holiness which we regard with dread as precluding carnal enjoyments, we

have not the spirit of those who fast. We are called to be "saints," and if we decline to be saints there is no second-rate, inferior calling we can fall back upon. We must learn to find our joy in God if the pleasures of sin are to lose their attraction. If we are to be delivered from dangerous sin, we must be willing to be delivered from all sin. If we are to keep sin out of the life it must be kept out of the heart; and it can be kept out of the heart only by filling the heart with holy purposes and spiritual desires.

But perhaps the most important truth of all which was elicited by the question from Bethel is that, in common with all religious service, fasting is meaningless and displeasing to God unless accompanied by holiness of life. Zechariah, as well as the older prophets, points out that the truest and most acceptable fast is abstinence from wrong-doing, from oppression of the widow, the fatherless, the stranger, and the poor. If sin makes such an impression on the conscience that the sinner cannot eat, the appropriate result of such impression is in conduct. Lowliness of spirit before God inevitably takes the form of loving and meek demeanour towards men.

Some persons carry this principle to an extreme, and say that all worship should take the form of work, and that apart from active beneficence there is no worship worthy of the name. We best show our worship of God when we accommodate ourselves to His appointments in life and do our duty where He has set us; and the Church perfected will be simply a society of men perfectly discharging the duties of their several callings. But this is only half the truth. As God is personal, there must be that interchange of thought and direct expression of feeling which constitute the charm and the strength of all personal intercourse. The good son emphatically utters his reverence and love for his parents while silently toiling for their support: but this

reverence and love are sustained by the look of affection, by the loving talk in the evening hour, by direct personal intercourse of one kind or other.

This reply regarding Fasts closes with the assurance that the fasts shall be turned into feasts, that days of uninterrupted gladness are approaching, days in which God shall so manifestly bless Israel that all nations shall observe and turn towards Jerusalem. "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." This is the ultimate attraction, the presence of God. This gradually approves itself as the most powerful determining influence in the life of nations and of individuals. It is this that secures the well-being and felicity here described. And the prediction that the Divine presence among the Jews would attract men to the race, has been fulfilled so far as the Western world is concerned. It is as manifested in the history of the Jews and in the person of Jesus of Nazareth that God has been recognised and worshipped by Christendom. After all the earnest pondering and anxious inquiry, after all the philosophical and scientific investigation which men have undertaken in every age to find out God, it is still the skirt of the Jew that forms the most hopeful hold in this great search.

Every one whose thirst for God compels him to meditate on such themes will inevitably ask: Why was such special, contrived, supernatural revelation required? Might it not have been expected that above all other equipment of our nature, we should have enjoyed a natural sensitiveness to God's presence and power of distinctly apprehending Him? All men have as their birthright the instincts and faculties which enable them to live a healthy physical life: might it not have been expected that each man should have been

furnished by a loving God with the consciousness of His presence and with a clear knowledge of God? Why confine for the longer part of this world's history the knowledge of God to one small, very small, portion of our race?

The doubts which such questions imply are relieved by several considerations. We are especially to consider that spiritually we are diseased, and are not in a position to say how distinctly a healthy spiritual nature might testify of God or how clearly it might see and know Him. Our nature has physical appetites which teach us how to maintain ourselves in physical life: but if these appetites are abused they cease to guide us safely. Besides, it is impossible to conceive how God could have revealed His nature and His will regarding us in any other way than through and in human history, culminating in the personal manifestation of Himself in Christ. For this personal manifestation the necessary preliminary was a gradual process of enlightenment, running parallel with a gradual growth of the human capacity for apprehending God and living for Him.

In our own day there is much honest perplexity about God, and one is sometimes tempted to desire a fresh revelation suited to the wants of our time. One always longs for some disclosure of God which would bring immediate conviction to all men. We cannot learn that spiritual things are spiritually discerned. When we look for God in nature He seems to evade us, and from the personal and responsive Being we look for He seems to become an impersonal force, which is indeed no respecter of persons, and which hears no broken-hearted entreaties. When we look for God within ourselves, we seem at times to see something of a holy Lawgiver who helps those who strive to keep His law; but there is much also which bids us believe we have to do with a system of nature which somehow favours, those who live in the way we call right-

eous. But in Christ we find one who is as personal as ourselves, and as Divine as we can conceive or as our needs require. In Him we find one whom instinctively we worship; one able to respond to and satisfy our faith; the Master of nature, unappalled in presence of its most terrific moods, overcoming its most overwhelming ills; one who is transcendent also in the moral world, alone upon earth unsullied by temptation, in the world and yet neither weakened, misled, nor lowered by its tone, and stretching His hand as from a position above all possibility of failure to all who crave His help. Whatever God is, that is God as we have to do with Him, God in human nature revealing Himself personally.

There are indeed those who own no need of a personal God, but find nature enough; who believe that as by a prudent use of this world our physical life may be enjoyable, so also by using wisely the moral laws which disclose themselves to us we can become all that is morally possible to us. They feel that much that is said of man's need of God arises from a timid selfishness that fears to stand alone, or at all events that it is exaggerated, and that in point of fact men do live happily without recognising God, and that to fear the future is unreasonable. But what are we to make of Christ? What is the significance of this unique phenomenon? We feel foolish when we even compare Him with any other man. What then ought a candid man to make of this? What is the *true* account of it—not only the account of it which looks plausible, but that which stands examination? Has not Christ in past ages proved His power to lead men to God, to strengthen the human spirit, to lift men out of what is degrading? Must we not lay hold on the skirt of this Jew if we are to find God and life eternal?

MARCUS DODS.

RECENT EGYPTIAN AND ASSYRIAN LITERATURE.

- I. *Das Aegyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie, aus verschiedenen Urkunden zusammengestellt und herausgegeben von Edouard Naville.* Erster Band, Text und Vignetten; zweiter Band, Varianten. Berlin, folio, 1886.
- II. *Catenæ in Evangelia Egyptiaca quæ supersunt.* Lagarde. Göttingen, 1886.
- III. *Les Actes des Martyrs de L'Egypte.* Texte Copte et traduction Française par Henri Hyvernat. Vol. i. pts. 1-3. Paris, 1886.

I. FROM the earliest days of the true decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphs, the greatest interest has been aroused in the minds of Egyptologists by the large collection of chapters, called the "Book of the Dead," selections from which are found inscribed on tombs, coffins, and papyri, from the earliest to the latest days of the Egyptian Empire. In Egyptian this collection is called *per em hru*, or "coming forth by day:" other translations of this title, such as "coming forth in" or "as the day," have been suggested, but the first makes the best sense, and is now generally adopted. The date of the composition of the work is unknown, but it must be very remote; for as far back as the XIth Dynasty, or about 2200 B.C., certain chapters bear evidence that the scribes who wrote them did not understand the passages which they wrote, and hence made nonsense of them. This would happen in various ways: the meaning and the traditional interpretation of the chapters might have been forgotten; the scribe might have been, and frequently was, wilfully careless; or he might have written from dictation, and have confused the signs, etc.

The first printed edition of the Book of the Dead was published in 1842, by the late Richard Lepsius,¹ from a hieroglyphic papyrus in Turin, which contains 165 chapters, and is the longest known. Notwithstanding its length and the large number of chapters which it contains, it yet lacks several which are found in the various papyri distributed throughout Europe; some of these being the oldest of them all. This faulty text remained untranslated until 1857, when the late Dr. Birch published a literal translation of it in the fifth volume of Bunsen's "Egypt's Place in

¹ *Das Todtenbuch der Aegypter nach dem Hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin.* Leipzig, 1842.

Universal History." This translation, though literal, is in many places quite unintelligible to the ordinary reader, because it has been made from a corrupt text, and because all the allusions which the writer or writers of this wonderful mythological book expected the reader to know and understand, are not familiar to us. One of the greatest difficulties in translating the Book of the Dead is caused by the variant readings, which have generally been taken into the text wholesale; though in some papyri attempts have been made to choose a good and correct reading.

The Book of the Dead remained in this unsatisfactory condition until 1874, when, at the Congress of Orientalists held in London, Dr. Lepsius proposed to Mr. Renouf that he should make a critical collation of the best copies of the Book of the Dead, in order to restore the text to its original condition at the period of the XIXth Dynasty. Owing to the lack of the necessary leisure, Mr. Renouf was obliged to decline what would have been to him a most congenial and fitting task, and M. Edouard Naville was the next eminent scholar to whom this important work was offered by Dr. Lepsius. For the carrying out of his labour of love, M. Naville visited London, Dublin, Paris, Marseilles, Leyden, Rome, Florence, Naples, Turin, Berlin, Hanover, Cairo, and other places, and collated about eighty-six hieroglyphic papyri, twenty-six of which belong to the British Museum. The result is that he has collected thousands of variant readings, and that the number of chapters has risen from 165 to 186. The latter, with their variant vignettes, have been most carefully and beautifully drawn from the different papyri, and printed in a handsome folio of 212 leaves. In the second volume, of 448 pages, M. Naville has arranged the variants in columns: the first contains generally the text of the papyrus of Neb-seni, in the British Museum, and the others give the different readings from the manuscripts of Paris, Leyden, Berlin, and elsewhere. Now for the first time it is possible for a good translation of the Book of the Dead to be made; all the chapters, and their variant readings and vignettes have been gathered together, and conveniently arranged, from the best papyri of the best period of the Egyptian Empire, that is from about 1700 to 1100 B.C. We hope that so able a scholar as Mr. Renouf will not leave the want of a translation long unsupplied; for the interest in the Book of the Dead is growing every day.

M. Naville has done his work ably and well, and it is impossible

to praise too highly the industry and learning shown in the performance of his tedious and laborious task. Unlike many books, it is quite impossible to do justice to its merits in article, notice, or review; it is a book which must be used well by the Egyptian student before he can really appreciate the great advantage of having a trustworthy collection of eighty-six papyri at his side for immediate reference. M. Naville has laid all Egyptologists under an immense debt of gratitude for his, from now and henceforth, standard work on the Book of the Dead; and the Prussian Government in affording important pecuniary assistance in the publishing of this work, has given another substantial proof of the interest which that enlightened body takes in the welfare of the science of Egyptology.

II. In *Catene in Evangelia Aegyptiaca* Dr. Paul de Lagarde has edited the Coptic text of the extracts from the four Gospels, with a patristic catena attached to each, which are found in a large and fine MS. belonging to Lord Zouche. This MS. was brought from the Coptic monastery of Souriani, on the Natron Lakes, to the west of the village of Jerraneh on the Nile, in 1838, and was written in the year of the Martyrs 605 = A.D. 889. The leaves of the MS. had been bound up without much regard to sequence or order, but Dr. Lagarde, after great patience and labour, has succeeded in publishing the continuous text, carefully marking the punctuation, and dividing the words and sentences. The extracts from St. Matthew, with their patristic catenæ, occupy nearly one-third of the work; and the commentators are for the most part Chrysostom, Cyril, Severus, and Titus, though Eusebius, Epiphanius Gregory, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and others, are at times quoted. The passages chosen for interpretation are generally taken from the parables and miracles of Christ, and the collections of the opinions from the works of the early Fathers of the Church which are quoted are exceedingly interesting, both for their own value and their appearance in a Coptic dress. Dr. Lagarde's work is a very important and valuable addition to the comparatively small library of printed Coptic books which exists; and the complete set of references to the New Testament and the Fathers is a very welcome help in using it.

III. We welcome most heartily the appearance of the first three parts of Dr. H. Hyvernat's work, entitled *Les Actes des Martyrs de L'Egypte*. St. Mark's teaching in Egypt was followed by the

greatest success, and by the result that thousands upon thousands of people in Lower Egypt embraced Christianity, and devoted themselves to an ascetic life; monasteries and convents for the devout of both sexes sprang up, not by tens but by hundreds. In addition to these, recluses and anchorites established themselves wherever an empty cave or hole in the rock could be found in which to shelter themselves from the bitter frosts of the Egyptian night. Their food consisted, as we know from the narrative of Paphnouti, of wild berries, and their drink was water; for dress they frequently had nothing but their long, tangled hair. In spite of the hard life they led, their numbers increased and multiplied until the savage onslaught made upon them by Diocletian, A.D. 304-5. The Nitrian desert, to the south of Alexandria, was peopled by five thousand anchorites; and the island of Tabenne was occupied by Pachomius and fourteen hundred of his followers. In Oxyrinchus alone it was computed that there were ten thousand females and twenty thousand males of the monastic profession; and Rufinus¹ says that there were as many monks in the desert as there were people in the cities. Since Egypt possessed this immense number of Christian enthusiasts, it is no wonder that the "noble army of martyrs" was so largely recruited from this superstitious country. The barbarity with which the persecution of these wretched creatures was carried out by the minions of Diocletian, and the fanatical obstinacy of the Egyptian converts, tended to make the struggle long and bloody. The histories of the martyrdoms of the saints were written down with the greatest care, and preserved as the most valuable of the archives of the convents. As they are not mere miraculous accounts of sufferings, but have bits of historical information and biography scattered among them, it is a great wonder that they have been so long left uncollected and nearly unknown; moreover, they are exceedingly valuable for the geographical information which they contain. Dr. Hyvernat has begun to publish the Coptic text of the Martyrdoms from the MSS. in the Vatican and the Borgian Museum. The paragraphs are left as they are in the original MSS.; and he gives a good running translation in French at the foot of each page, together with his emendations. On page 41 we notice a misprint, *les torturdît* for *le torturât*. The first three parts—all which have appeared up to the present—contain the

¹ *Vitæ Patrum*, chap. 7.

martyrdoms of Saints Eusebius, the son of Basilides, Macarius of Antioch, Apater and Érai, the son and daughter of Basilides, Pisonra, Piroon, Athom, John, Simeon, Apa Ari, and Macrobius. There is some monotony in reading these martyrdoms, for in many cases the construction of the narrative is exactly the same, and the same phrases are used over and over again. After the first torturing, Christ appears to His suffering saint and heals his wounds, telling him to be of good cheer, that he shall die one, two, three or four times (as in the case of St. George of Cappadocia) and that eventually He will come and take him up to heaven in His chariot. The account of the tortures is most horrible and frequently very difficult to translate. Dr. Hyvernât has, so far, done this very carefully and well; and we hope that he will include in the second volume of his work a chapter on the instruments of torture used by the Roman governors upon the unhappy Egyptians. Such a chapter was made by Georgi in his *De Miraculis Sancti Coluthi*, but that could now be very much improved and enlarged. The remarkable efficacy of the martyrs' shrines for healing diseases is insisted on with great pertinacity; and the accounts of the cures wrought are truly wonderful. We marvel not that Dr. Hyvernât prefaces his work with: "Le but de cette publication est, avant tout, philologique. . . . A plus forte raison ne vœux-je pas sembler approuver des discours peu orthodoxes ou fanatiques, que les interpolateurs ont mis, parfois, dans la bouche des martyrs."

Dr. Hyvernât's labour is long and arduous, but very important, for these martyrdoms contain facts found nowhere else. When complete it will form a valuable supplement to the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, and we await with eagerness the end of the work which he has so well begun.

I. *Assyrische Lesestücke nebst Paradigmen, Schrifttafel und kleinem Wörterbuch*, von Friedrich Delitzsch. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig, 1885.

II. *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen und akkadischen Wörter der Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. ii., von J. N. Strassmaier. Leipzig, 1886.

I. Assyrian students and others who remember the first edition of Dr. Delitzsch's *Lesestücke* will, at the sight of this new and

third edition, see that the author has endeavoured to improve that faulty and incomplete work, with some success. The first edition was little more than a selection from easy, and for the most part already published texts, with a very meagre syllabary, and was prepared for beginners who were supposed to be ignorant alike of Assyrian and every other Semitic dialect. The new edition has a higher aim, and announces itself as a complete "guide to the perplexed" in matters Assyrian. The first few pages of the book contain lists of pronouns, adverbs, and prepositions taken from the lists given in the works of Oppert, Schrader, and Sayce, on Assyrian grammar; the verb-scheme which follows these is based entirely upon that laid down by Dr. Oppert in 1868, in his *Éléments de la Grammaire Assyrienne*. After these come two pages of transcribed Assyrian, containing the account of Sennacherib's attack upon Jerusalem, published by Smith and Sayce in 1878. The translation of this extract is important, since it shows that in spite of the "Bestrebungen der Assyriologen Schulen des Continents während der letzten Jahren," most of the difficulties which puzzled Oppert, Rawlinson, Smith, and Sayce, remain still to be cleared up. Following always the arrangement of the syllabary with phonetic values in Sayce's Grammar, Dr. Delitzsch devotes the next thirty-five pages to this important elementary matter. He has added in some cases the archaic and cursive Babylonian forms of the Assyrian signs; the former he has made out by the transcript of the Nebuchadnezzar text published by Rawlinson and Norris, and the latter he has borrowed, without acknowledgment, from the sign-list published by Mr. Pinches. Next in order Dr. Delitzsch gives copies of the most important two and three column syllabaries, based upon the texts published by Rawlinson, Norris, and Smith; these are followed by copies of the fragments of the "Creation" and "Deluge" tablets, which were translated by Smith in his *Chaldean Genesis*. It would be tedious to enumerate all the extracts given from the texts published by the Trustees of the British Museum, so we pass to the copy of an interesting document which Dr. Delitzsch has named *Ein Heirathscontract*. As he does not give the British Museum catalogue number, nor refer to any publication in which a copy of this tablet has appeared, we are driven to the unavoidable conclusion that Dr. Delitzsch does not know how to copy Babylonian, or even to read it when it has been copied for him. The following

explanations will make our meaning plain. The interesting little document of which Dr. Delitzsch professes to give a copy, is a clay tablet $2\frac{3}{4}$ in. long by $2\frac{1}{3}$, and is dated on the 13th day of Têbeth, in the 34th year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. It relates how a certain Ziria promised to give seven manchs of silver and three slaves, etc. as a dowry to his daughter Ina-e-sagili-ramat on the day of her marriage with Iddina-Marduk. The tablet contains twenty-six lines of writing, parts of some of which go round the edge; these last have proved a stumbling-block to the learned editor of the *Lesestücke*. At the end of the second line of his copy, where the name Nur-Sin comes, Dr. Delitzsch has represented a piece broken, but there is neither a character wanting nor a piece broken; he has only failed to read the sign for the moon-god Sin. Had he known anything of the contract tablets he could never have imagined that *Nur* by itself, was a name; and had he only consulted the Appendix to Strassmaier's *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss* which he himself edited, he would have found on page 50 about thirty-eight places enumerated in which the name *Nur-Sin* occurs. In the eighth line Dr. Delitzsch makes *i-shak* to be the last two characters of this line on the tablet; here again he has made an egregious blunder, having left out *ka-nu*, the last two signs of the verbal form *i-shak-ka-nu*. This is a serious mistake, for it shows (1) that he did not recognise a verbal form of frequent occurrence in the contract tablets; (2) that he did not know what he was copying. We are anxious to know how he would explain this blunder to the "Assyriologen Schule" in Leipzig. On the *reverse* of the tablet, line 2, he makes the last sign to be partially obliterated; this is incorrect, for it is one of the clearest upon the tablet. On the *reverse*, line 4, he encloses one half of the last sign *kar* in a square bracket, as if it were wanting on the tablet, but it is not; and the sign *ir*, which is the phonetic complement of the previous sign, showing that the two together are to be read *edir*, he omits altogether. On the *reverse*, line 8, the word for scribe, *dup-sarru*, is represented as being on the flat surface of the tablet: this also is incorrect, for the last sign is written round upon the edge.¹ In the second edition of the *Lesestücke*,

¹ We have verified all these statements upon a cast of the tablet made by Mr. Ready, of the British Museum. It appears only too plain to us that Dr. Delitzsch has plagiarised, and has made his copy from a lithographic sketch of the inscription published in the *British Archaeological Journal* for 1880, pp.

Dr. Delitzsch announced on the last page that his book was without mistakes ("Schreibfehler vacat"), while there were several mistakes in copying on page 80 alone; as there are so many in this one short text which we have quoted, we are glad to see that this piece of arrogance is not repeated.

II. For many years past it has been felt by Semitic scholars in general and students of Assyrian in particular, that an Assyrian vocabulary was absolutely necessary if that language was to be more generally studied. Every student was obliged to collect words for himself upon slips, and to try and make out their meaning; but every one who had not the British Museum collection of tablets always at hand soon found that it was quite impossible to make anything like a good word-list, for new tablets with new words upon them were being continually acquired by that institution. Since the personal jealousies of Assyriologists rendered co-operation in the matter of a dictionary impossible, it became clear that some one scholar would be obliged to devote many years to the preparation of an Assyrian vocabulary, for a dictionary is not possible for many a year yet. As the appearance of Dr. Strassmaier's "Verzeichniss" marks an era in the history of Assyrian lexicography—inasmuch as all future dictionaries must be based upon this work—a few remarks upon what has been done in this branch of Assyrian will not be out of place here. The first scholar who gave himself up to the task of making a vocabulary was Edwin Norris. His qualifications for the work were excellent, for he had a thorough knowledge of the cuneiform tablets, and with Sir Henry Rawlinson he copied and prepared for publication the texts contained in the first two volumes of that immortal work the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. In addition to this, he was a good general linguist, and had a really practical knowledge of Hebrew, with which language modern Assyriologists have but slight acquaintance. After some years of work he brought out three parts of his *Assyrian Dictionary*, which unhappily he never lived to complete. His plan was to collect all the Assyrian signs the phonetic values of which began with a certain letter, and to place them at the

393-404. Here the copyist only gave a view of the *obverse* and *reverse*, not a *copy*, of the tablet; if the curious reader will take the trouble to compare Dr. Delitzsch's copy with this sketch, he will see that he has even imitated the conventional manner of drawing the signs employed there by the copyist.

head of words beginning with those same signs. He gave the various ways of spelling in Assyrian each word quoted, and the cognate form in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Arabic by the side, followed by three or four extracts in cuneiform type with transliteration and translation, showing the use of the word. He frequently added short notes and extracts from the native bilingual syllabaries, which materially assist in understanding the text, and when he was in doubt as to the meaning of a word he usually gave the opinion of Oppert or Hincks. As a whole, and for the time at which it was written, this *Dictionary* is truly marvellous, and the day that saw the death of this great but modest Assyrian scholar was an unlucky one for Assyriology. For technical skill in copying and sagacity in the decipherment and reading of almost illegible inscriptions, there may arise Assyriologists as great as Edwin Norris, but none greater.

After Norris's death nothing more was done towards making an Assyrian vocabulary until 1878, when Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch visited England with the avowed and announced purpose of making one. Up to the present this intention has never been carried out, although the work has been announced as being "in the press" year after year; and, if we except the eleven pages of vocabulary in his *Lesestücke*, and the contributions to the works of his pupils, students have not been able to benefit by any of Dr. Delitzsch's labours on lexicography. It is but fair to say why he has not fulfilled his promise: in the first place his duties chain him to Leipzig for a large portion of the year, and his visits to the British Museum have been too brief to enable him to copy one-hundredth part of the unpublished fragments there. The Leipzig Assyriologists without tablets are like astronomers without telescopes. Hitherto Dr. Delitzsch has devoted himself entirely to the collation of Assyrian texts which have been published for many years; now, every one knows that it is much easier to collate and perhaps to correct a sign here and there in Rawlinson's text, than to copy a tablet for the first time for oneself. Of late years Mr. Rassam has brought home from Babylonia a huge mass of tablets and fragments in the Babylonian character which are exceedingly difficult to make out, but these are most valuable for lexicographical purposes on account of the syllabaries and the lists of words which they contain. In the copying of Babylonian inscriptions Dr. Delitzsch has had little

practice; this is proved by the many mistakes he has made in copying the one small text published on page 125 of his *Lesestücke*, and by the fact that a most valuable fragment of the fourth Creation tablet, written in Babylonian, lay before him for weeks at the British Museum unrecognised. Moreover, not to go too much into details, the list of countries published in his *Sprache der Kossäer* was corrected in many important places from the private copy of an English student. We mention this because Dr. Delitzsch has omitted to do so. That Dr. Delitzsch cannot give anything like a complete list of Assyrian words in his *Wörterbuch* from the materials which he now has, may be easily seen by examining Bezold's last work, where it is painfully evident how few unpublished texts he has copied. Apart from the lack of technical skill in copying, Dr. Delitzsch has shown, by the writings of himself and of his pupils, that he lacks a practical acquaintance with the common Semitic dialects of Hebrew, Syriac and Chaldee. But what Dr. Oppert has said of Dr. Haupt "dass Herr Haupt von der Aussprache einer lebenden semitischen Sprache nicht die geringste Kenntniss hat zeigt er fast auf jeder Seite,"¹ is really more applicable to Dr. Delitzsch than to Dr. Haupt. He has studied the various Semitic dictionaries, and has drawn conclusions from them, but the absurdity of many of them may be seen by referring to the comparisons with other Semitic languages given on page 67 of Dr. Strassmaier's *Verzeichniss*; as Dr. Delitzsch edited this work he is responsible for them. As we have now shown why Dr. Delitzsch has not published his Assyrian *Wörterbuch*, let us proceed to the consideration of the last contribution to the lexicography of this language. Dr. Strassmaier has avoided the mistake made by Norris and Delitzsch, by modestly calling his work a *Verzeichniss*, not a dictionary. This "list" contains 9,072 words together with a glossary of 1,586 words and names, which occur in the copies of the Liverpool collection of contract tablets which he published in the Transactions of the Oriental Congress held in Leyden in 1883. Several passages are quoted from the cuneiform inscriptions where each word occurs, so that it is now possible to try if a meaning proposed suits more than one context and makes sense. We have picked out at random the reference to a number of passages and have verified them and found them correct, yet one must not be surprised i

¹ See *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 17th December, 1879.

some clerical errors should be found in a book containing some sixty thousand quotations! Dr. Strassmaier has corrected many errors in previously published texts, but he leaves the reader to find this out. To the scholar and the advanced cuneiform student this book will be invaluable, but it has, in our opinion, one defect; the meanings of the words are not given. Dr. Strassmaier is quite right in not forcing meanings into words, or making guesses at them, but it would have been such a boon if he had put meanings to all the words which occur in the historical and other more important inscriptions, and would have wonderfully helped the beginner. As it is, this defect can easily be remedied; if Dr. Strassmaier will only set to work and compile a small vocabulary of 1,000 or 1,500 words, he will earn the gratitude of all present and future Assyrian students. As he has all the materials at hand for this work we think he should lose no time in doing it. The eleven hundred and forty-four pages which compose Dr. Strassmaier's *Verzeichniss* have been lithographed from his own clear and very distinct handwriting; we heartily congratulate him on the conclusion of this great and important work. The most unsatisfactory portion of the book is the preface; as Dr. Delitzsch and Dr. Haupt are the editors of the work, we feel compelled to call them to account for some unpardonable omissions. That the *Verzeichniss* is based upon the work of Edwin Norris is clear to every one, yet we look through the preface in vain for any mention of this scholar's work. The sin which cries aloud in its pages is the want of common honesty in acknowledging the labours of the English and French Assyriologists. In the first paragraph we read "Seit den grundlegenden Arbeiten von Sir Henry Rawlinson und Jules Oppert haben die fortgesetzten Ausgrabungen in Mesopotamien unsere Kenntnisse stetig erweitert und geordnet, neue Fragen wurden angeregt, alte Vermutungen bezweifelt und beseitigt, andere wieder bestätigt, und auf die immer eindringendere philologische Genauigkeit in detail Fragen waren die Bestrebungen der Assyriologen Schulen des Continents während der letzter Jahre gerichtet." Why is it that the names of Hincks, Schrader, Norris, Smith and Sayce are omitted from this one-sided description of the progress of Assyriology? Surely Dr. Delitzsch cannot imagine that he and the few young men to whom he has taught the rudiments of Assyrian are the only people who have advanced our knowledge of this language? He

is not even the author of the best Assyriological work that has appeared on the Continent, for that has been done by Drs. Oppert and Schrader, whose works and conclusions Dr. Delitzsch has freely used without acknowledgment. He is a diligent gleaner from other people's works, but he lacks the technical skill required for copying, and has not sufficient knowledge of the Semitic languages to enable him to play the part he has chosen for himself. In support of this last statement we will give one typical instance. There appeared at Leipzig, in 1876, a German translation of Smith's *Chaldean Genesis*, with "Erläuterungen und fortgesetzten Forschungen," by Friedrich Delitzsch. On page 76 we find Smith's translation,¹ "which is eaten by the stomach," rendered by "so gegessen wird vom Magen." The two Assyrian words which are thus rendered are *a-kil ḫar-si*, and are to be translated by *calumniator* or *slanderer*: they are the Assyrian form of the very common name for Satan in Aramaic, אֲכִל קִרְסָא. With Smith's rendering we have no fault to find, because, knowing neither Hebrew nor Syriac, he could not be expected to translate the passage correctly. Dr. Delitzsch, however, professes to be acquainted with Semitic languages, and yet he perpetuates this blunder, and does not see that the German, as well as the English, is utter nonsense, such as no Assyrian ever inscribed upon clay; for Assyrians knew perfectly well that it is the *mouth* that eats, and not the *belly*. Moreover, *akil ḫar-sa* means "the eater of a piece (of flesh)," the last word אֲכִל having nothing whatever to do with the word for *belly*, קִרְסָא (common to Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, as well as Assyrian), with which the learned German Assyriologist has confounded it. It was many years before Dr. Delitzsch understood that Assyrian was akin to the Aramaic dialects; many of his conclusions laid down in his *Assyrische Studien* are now proved to be quite wrong; he could never have written his *Wo lag das Paradies* unless Rawlinson had first published his papers on Assyrian geography, and Schrader his *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, and Oppert his *Expédition en Mésopotamie*; nearly all his published texts are based upon the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, by Rawlinson assisted by Norris and Smith; and the scheme of Assyrian grammar given in his *Lesestücke*, pp. ix.-xi., is founded upon Oppert's *Éléments de la Grammaire Assyrienne* (a second edition

¹ *Chaldean Genesis*, 1st Ed., page 78.

of which appeared in Paris in 1868), although given without any acknowledgment of that work. We might increase these instances, but we forbear. E.

BREVIÆ.

On Hebrews ix. 16, 17.—I venture to suggest that perhaps a consideration of the legal ideas of the time when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, may help to explain this difficult passage. The idea of a will was derived by the Jews from the Romans, and they probably associated with it the various ideas which had grown up around the Roman will. Let us see what these were. The origin of the ordinary form of a Roman will, was the old testament *per æs et libram*, by which the father of the family (generally when on his death bed) sold his whole family and estate to some friend in whom he had confidence (called the *heres*), on trust to carry out his wishes (an obligation which apparently was not originally legally enforceable, though afterwards it was recognised by law). This form was still kept up, though probably at the time when the Epistle was written, the *familiæ emptor* was not generally the same person as the *heres*. Still the *familiæ emptor* represented the *heres*, and served to keep the theoretical nature of the transaction before all parties concerned, and the *heres* was looked upon not merely as a distributor of goods, but as the purchaser and master of the family. It is therefore suggested that the argument is somewhat as follows. By the first *διαθήκη* the Hebrews were purchased and became the bondsmen of the Law (an idea already rendered familiar to them by Exod. xv. 16 and Ps. lxxiv. 2) ; but by a new *διαθήκη* our Lord purchased them with His blood (Acts xx. 28), as the *heres* or *familiæ emptor* purchased the inheritance, and having thus purchased the inheritance of the Law, became the new master of the bondsmen of the Law, and the mediator, or executor of a new dispensation. But inasmuch as the right of the *heres* can only come into operation after the death of the testator (the Law), it is evident that, if the new dispensation has begun, the Law is dead and is no longer their master. In fact, the line of argument seems similar to that in Rom. vii. 1-4.

H. S. KEATING.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF HEINRICH EWALD.¹

I. THE DEVELOPMENT PERIOD.

It will, I hope, not be thought paradoxical if I associate the names of Butler and Ewald. Different as they are in many respects, I venture to trace a real historical connexion between them. To Queen Caroline's insight was due the promotion of Bishop Butler, and the influence of the same wise queen was not without weight in the foundation of the University of Göttingen. Of that renowned *Hochschule*, Ewald is one of the most typical representatives. History and philology were from the first the most favoured subjects in this emphatically statesmanlike institution, and history and philology constitute the field on which Heinrich Ewald has won imperishable fame. Butler, both as an ethical philosopher and as a theologian, would have been at home in Göttingen, where, both in theology and in philosophy, observation and facts have always had the precedence over *à priori* speculation, and where theoretic theology in particular has ever had a moderate and so to speak Butlerian tinge. Ewald on his side would in some respects have been at home in England, at any rate in the more liberal England of to-day. He had always a tenderness for this country; and even if we can partly justify our predecessors for the suspiciousness of their attitude towards him, we may nevertheless hold that, with all their defects, no books can be more important for advanced Bible-students than those

¹ Inaugural lecture delivered by the writer, as Oriel Professor of Interpretation, in the Divinity School, Oxford, June, 1886.

of Ewald. He may indeed be as useful to us in our present stage as he was in his earlier period to Germany; and if his influence is waning there, let us not be backward to accord him a friendly reception here. The Germans, it appears, would fain annex Richard Bentley; let us retaliate by annexing or assimilating all that is best in the great, the faulty, but the never to be forgotten Heinrich Ewald.

I am not one of those who think it the duty of a biographer to idolize his hero, and shall have, alas! to admit that Ewald failed in a serious degree to attain his high ideal. But he has been to many, thank God! a source of truest inspiration, and the tragedy of his career in no respect diminishes their reverence for his memory. Suffer me to show you this childlike great man in his strength and in his weakness.

He was born at Göttingen in 1803, and there most of his life was passed. A touch of provincialism was therefore native to Ewald, and this was not counteracted by that variety of culture which many German students gain by a change of university. Ewald himself, it is true, saw no reason to desire a change. He was destined to set an example of concentration, and this object could nowhere be better secured than in Göttingen. Did he want recreation? There was that ample library, then not less famous than the university itself. He had no time for that social intercourse of fellow-students which it is so sweet to most to look back upon, his laborious day being divided between his own studies and private tuition. He was never caught up, like even Michaelis,¹ into the contemporary æsthetic

¹ See J. D. Michaelis, *Poetischer Entwurf der Gedanken des Prediger-Buchs Salomons*. (Göttingen, 1751.) In the preface he speaks of amusing himself with poetical composition. Ewald very rarely refers to German literature. Herder is only mentioned as a writer on the Old Testament. Once he speaks of the good fortune of Eichhorn in working during the blossoming time of the national intellect, and once he highly eulogizes Klopstock in a characteristic note, omitted in the English translation of the *History* (see the German edition, iii. 306, note 1).

movement, nor did he ever, like Herder, pass under the spell of philosophy. He had indeed, as his works prove, a sense of poetic art, and even more a deep love of ideas, but art and ideas were to him but the historical manifestations of national life. By one of those strange impulses which so often occur in the history of genius, he chose the East for his field of study while still at the gymnasium. If he studied the classics, it was clearly not as the humanities, but as a necessary part of his historical apparatus; for he well knew that no language or literature can be adequately studied by itself. His Latin is not that of Bishop Lowth, but as a compensation even his early works show a deep knowledge of Arabic literature. Eichhorn and Tychsen, both distinguished Orientalists, were his academic teachers; for both of them he cherished feelings of piety, though he would not own that they had materially influenced his opinions. And yet, though I can easily imagine that Ewald's mind was very early mature, I think he *was* influenced, especially by Eichhorn, to whom his own principles and career present several points of resemblance. Eichhorn, so generously eulogized of late by Dr. Edersheim,¹ was at least as many-sided though not as profound as Ewald. He loved the Bible as being a literature, as well as the record of a revelation; I say the Bible, because, like Ewald, Eichhorn was not merely an *Old Testament* scholar. He was also, in the best sense of the word, like Ewald an *advanced* Biblical critic. And yet it must be added that, though like Ewald and every other great critic he stood aloof from theological extremes, he yet retained an unflagging interest in the progress of theology. Like Ewald again, he was not merely a Hebraist but a Semitic philologist, and propagated that sound doctrine of the so-called Tenses, which is due especially to that patriarch of Semitic learning, Albert Schultens. He was, like Ewald in his best

¹ *Prophecy and History*, p. 194.

days, a popular and indefatigable lecturer, but not content with this, he acknowledged a responsibility to the world of scholars in general. For many years,¹ following the example of J. D. Michaelis, he published an *Allgemeine Bibliothek für biblische Litteratur* (all his own work), and a *Repertorium für morgenländische Litteratur*, which remind us of the *Biblische Jahrbücher* and the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, the latter mainly founded by Ewald, the former entirely written by him, only that Eichhorn's style is far more lucid than Ewald's, and his tolerance as charming as Ewald's intolerance is painful. Lastly, the influence of Eichhorn on contemporary thought was at least equal in extent, if not in intensity, to that of his great disciple.

Do not think this a digression. Part of the greatness of Ewald's life is its consistency. Such as he was at the opening of his career, such in all essentials he remained to its close. He found much to learn, but very little to unlearn. He tells us himself² that he never had to pass through circuitous paths of gloom, nor through grievous inward struggles; that from the first he perceived that the fearful-seeming New is really nothing but the Old, better understood and farther developed. This consistency is not to be accounted for solely by tenacity of character; it implies also that he fell in with wise and congenial teachers. He was consistent, because he lost no time through being badly taught, and because he found a work ready to his hand. He carried on the work of his teacher, Eichhorn, supplementing Eichhorn's deficiencies and correcting his faults, just as Eichhorn carried on that of Herder on the one hand, and Michaelis on the other. The portraits of Herder and Eichhorn, indeed, hung on the walls of Ewald's study,

¹ I might have added that from Heyne's death to his own, Eichhorn edited the well-known *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*.

² *Die poetischen Bücher des A. T.*, iv. (1837), p. 249.

as if to remind him of the aim and spirit of their common enterprise. That aim was nothing less than the recovery of the true meaning of the Bible, and the spirit in which it was pursued by these three great men was not less practical than scientific. Herder and Ewald especially had a full consciousness of the religious interests staked on the success of their work, and when Ewald speaks, in the *History of Christ*, of the "wondrous charm of a task which germinates out of a Divine appointment and necessity,"¹ it is difficult to think that the words did not flow from the experience of his youthful days. The Church-historian, Hase, has described Ewald, in language suggested perhaps by a famous saying of Hegel, as a prophet with backward gaze.² Ewald's style and manner are often in character with this function, and many a striking passage in his prefaces suggests an inner experience analogous to that of a prophetic call. "Truly," he says in his *Johannine Writings*, "if God did not give us in youth a surplus of boldest enterprise and cheerfullest faith, and thrust us, whether we would or no, into the midst of His truths and everlasting powers, O how should we find the force and the confidence amid tedious temptations and struggles always to be true to that which we have once for all recognised as the True in itself, and also in His goodness and His grace, as our undeniable duty."³

Ewald, then, felt himself called to do a prophet's work for the history and literature of the prophet-people Israel. Called, first of all, to a more special preparation, to which the outer events of his life were to be made subservient. And the very first change which came was advantageous to the future expositor and historian. As a youthful graduate of nineteen, he became in 1823 a teacher in the Gymnasium at Wolfenbüttel (in the Duchy of Brunswick, 37 miles

Geschichte Christus, p. 183.

² *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 582.

³ *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, ii., Vorrede, S. v.

from Hanover), with free access to that fine library of which Lessing had once been the keeper. There he occupied his leisure by studying and making extracts from Arabic MSS., feeling doubtless already the great importance of Arabic, both for the language and for the literature of the Hebrew race. On this subject let me quote to you the words of Ewald in 1831, "*Linguae arabicæ, semiticarum principis, cognitio diligentior ceterarum stirpis hujus linguarum, hebrææ potissimum, studio non utilissimum tantum est sed necessarium prorsus. . . . Tutoque contendas, qui cultissimam stirpis hujus linguam bene perspexerit, hunc demum circa omnes semiticas haud cœcutire incipere*";¹ and for the other part of my statement those of one of Ewald's greatest pupils: "I have no doubt that the original gifts and ideas of the primitive Hebrews can most readily be understood by comparing Arabian antiquity."²

This is not the time to explain the sense in which these two statements are to be understood. Ewald himself used Arabic more for the purposes of philology, than for those of what may be called comparative ethnic-psychology. And no doubt philological purposes are the most important from the point of view of exegesis and of theology. Ewald would therefore have hailed the proposed institution of an Oriental School in Oxford. Himself by taste, though not, I admit, equally by endowments, at once philologist and theologian, he would have insisted on the importance not only of Hebrew to the theologian, but of the other Semitic languages to the Hebraist. He was himself by no means a biassed advocate of the claims of Arabic, though circumstances early drew his special attention to it, and the richness and variety of its literature, combined with the exquisite refinement of its style, made it perhaps his

¹ *Grammatica critica lingue Arabicæ*, Pref. p. lii.
Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Heft i.

favourite among the Semitic languages. His own position on the relationship between the Semitic languages is best seen from his *Abhandlung über die geschichtliche Folge der semitischen Sprachen* (1871), with which compare his remarks in § 7 of his Arabic Grammar.

Ewald was now a schoolmaster. But he had no intention of remaining in this profession. He wished to think his own thoughts away from Eichhorn, and to make researches in a fresh library, preparatory to another book. To *another* book, you will say? Yes; for his first book, though published at Brunswick, was the fruit of his student leisure at Göttingen; he must have begun to print almost as soon as he arrived at Wolfenbüttel. It was called *Die Composition der Genesis kritisch untersucht*, and bears the date 1823. Ewald's acuteness and ingenuity are already abundantly displayed in this volume; he seeks to show that there is a unity in the Book of Genesis and a well-ordered plan which of itself forbids the literary analysis of Genesis, whether into documents or into fragments. It was certainly dangerous for so young an author to publish his results; for how few are able to retract what they have once said in print! Happily at this early period Ewald had still the power of self-criticism, and upon further reflection retracted the main position of his book. His words are, "So ergreife ich gern die Gelegenheit dieser Recension, um zu erklären, dass jene Schrift, was diesen einzelnen Punkt betrifft, nur noch historische Bedeutung habe." This was in a review of Stähelin's *Kritische Untersuchungen*, published in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* in 1831, the same year, it is not irrelevant to remark, in which he published his critical Arabic grammar. A deeper study of the phenomena of Genesis had shown him the complexity of the critical problem, and the inadmissibility of a simple and, from a purely Western point of view, a natural solution, and a wider acquaintance with the Arabic historians had revealed a

process of composition which made him repent his precipitate rejection of both the hitherto current critical hypotheses. I am thankful however that Ewald wrote this book. It helps us to refute the charge that he deals merely in fancy-criticism. It shows that even in youth, when the fancy is generally at its strongest, he was fully aware of the dangers which beset critical analysis, and if at the age of nineteen he could not fully realize the nature of the problem of Genesis, much less solve it, yet he did contribute both to a better statement of the problem and to a somewhat more adequate solution. It is pleasing to be able to say that, though the youthful Ewald freely criticized not only Vater but Eichhorn, the latter did not withhold his commendation, and in the following year (1824) procured Ewald's recall to Göttingen as Repetent or Tutorial Fellow in the Theological Faculty.

This, however, as might be expected, was only a transition; in 1827 he was promoted to a professorship. Just as Eichhorn, when called to Göttingen, had three years and no more to work with Michaelis, so Ewald, in the like circumstances, had but the same space of time allotted him as the colleague of Eichhorn. The veteran's work was done. He had sketched the main outlines of the right method of Biblical criticism, and had himself brought out by it not a few assured results; but an infinite amount of *Detailforschung*, of minute research, had yet to be gone through, before that historical reconstruction for which he longed could safely be attempted. The captious and arbitrary procedure and unrefreshing results of less able and less sympathetic critics than Eichhorn had disgusted very many with the Old Testament, and we hear Tholuck saying in his inaugural lecture in 1821, that "for the last twenty or thirty years the opinion has been generally prevalent, that the study of the Old Testament for theologians, as well as the devotional reading of it for the laity,

is either entirely profitless or at least promises but little advantage.”¹

The prejudice lingered on in Germany, and exercised a pernicious influence on the historical and theological views of such eminent personages as Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Baur, the Gnostics of modern times, as Ewald severely styles them. See how much hangs on the completeness of a theological professoriate! If Halle and Tübingen had had Old Testament professors like Eichhorn, or if those three great men had finished their theological studies (for Hegel, as you know, began as a *theologe*) at Göttingen, upon how much sounder a basis in some respects would their systems rest! Would the youthful successor of Eichhorn be the man to destroy this prejudice? He aspired to be this and even more than this; we shall see later on what it was that hindered his complete success. But we shall do well to remember at this point that other chosen instruments were in course of training simultaneously with Ewald. I need only mention Umbreit, Bleek, and Hengstenberg, the former of whom became professor at Heidelberg in 1823, and the two latter professors at Berlin in 1823 and 1828 respectively. To all these men we in England are, in various degrees, directly or indirectly indebted. Nothing shall induce me to take a side with Ewald against Hengstenberg, or with Hengstenberg against Ewald. Sixty years ago the prospects of the Old Testament in England seemed hopeless; Pusey, who became professor in 1828, did all that he could, by setting an example of a scholar in the grand style, and by insisting on a sound linguistic basis for exegesis, but without the help of German scholars of all tendencies the work of

¹ *Einige apologetische Winke für das Studium des A. T.'s, den Studirenden des jetzigen Decenniums gewidmet*, translated under the title, "Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament," in *Philological Tracts*, edited by John Brown, D.D., vol. i. (Edinburgh, 1833).

regenerating Old Testament studies in England would still be almost as hopeless as when Pusey, not with greater learning but with more judgment than Lee, began it.

I am now approaching the most important part of Ewald's life, and am anxious to show that the subject of my lecture has a living interest for English students. Ewald's success or failure in Germany meant, though few doubtless knew it at the time, the success or failure of the cause of the Old Testament in England. I appeal to our young students to regard the life and work of Ewald with something of the same reverence with which they regard that of our own Pusey. Of the religious spirit in which Ewald entered on his career I have spoken already. That inner experience which I have referred to as a call, gave a sanctity, if I may say so, to the most abstruse questions of philological research. In 1825 Ewald published a small treatise on Arabic metres, the results of which were incorporated into his Arabic Grammar, and in 1827 made his first incursion into the domain of the Aryan languages by an essay on some of the older Sanskrit metres. The young scholar, you will see, chafes already at restrictions; he will not be outdone by the great English theologians of the seventeenth century; he will be an Orientalist, and not merely a Semitic scholar. Soon you will see that he is not content with being in the bare sense an Orientalist; he will be a comparative philologist. And yet we cannot doubt that the religious interest animates all his philological work. He has a deep sense of the wonderfulness of "God's greatest gift"¹—language, and none of the Biblical conceptions does he appreciate more than that of the Logos. He will delight ever afterwards to trace the resemblances and the differences of the Biblical and the other religions, and in his great series of annual

¹ Max Müller, *Science of Language*, i. 3.

Biblical reviews he is careful not to omit illustrative works on Oriental subjects. In all this he did but act in the spirit of his predecessor Eichhorn, who had a true presentiment of the future importance of the comparative study of sacred books. In 1826 this taste of his was strengthened by a literary journey to Berlin, where he had fruitful intercourse with one of the older Sanskrit scholars, F. A. Rosen. One incidental result of his Sanskrit studies was the discovery (as it seemed to him) of the manifold use of Sanskrit for the correct explanation of Hebrew. It is, in fact, in this early period that he allowed himself the widest range. In 1826, the year of his Berlin visit, he began to lecture on Sanskrit, to which he afterwards added Persian, Turkish, Armenian, Coptic: I need not mention specially the various Semitic languages.¹ It is as if he had taken to heart the saying of Bp. Pearson, "Non est theologus nisi qui et Mithradates." He even formed the plan of a work exactly agreeing with that undertaken, but only in part executed, by M. Renan, of a history and comparative grammar of the Semitic languages.² His taste, however, was chiefly for Arabic, though the only text which he published was that of Wakidi on the Conquest of Mesopotamia, in 1827. He once hoped to compose a history of the intellectual movement among the Arabs, closing with the death of Mohammed;³ a task, it would almost seem, for which the materials are still too scanty. I should suppose that a vast number of ideas were continually arising in his fertile brain, and slowly taking shape in lectures, articles,

¹ Among the Orientalists who passed through the school of Ewald may be mentioned Schleier, Osiander, Dillmann, Schrader, and, one of the latest, Stern the Egyptologist.

² *Grammatica critica lingue Arabicæ*, vol. ii. Præf. p. iii.; comp. Vorrede to the Hebrew Grammar of 1827.

³ *Abhandlung über die geschichtliche Folge der Semitischen Sprachen* (1871), p. 61, note.

and reviews. But none of them, I am sure, was allowed to obscure the master-project on which he said, in 1859, that his mind had been working for far more than thirty years—the project of a history of the growth of true religion in the midst of the people of Israel.

It is remarkable that the first Old Testament book to which Ewald devoted himself in the maturity of his powers, was one “in less direct connexion with lofty interests”—the Song of Songs. By selecting it, he not only evidenced his firm adhesion to the view of the Old Testament as a literature, established by Lowth, Herder, and Eichhorn, but took the first step towards ascertaining that frankly human basis of a sound and healthy popular life on which alone the superstructure of what he loves to call the true religion could possibly be reared. He is proof against the temptation to which another great Semitic-Aryan scholar (E. H. Palmer) succumbed, when he said, “If you would feel that Song of Songs, then join awhile the mystic circle of the Súfis.” The extravagant mysticism to which Tholuck had not long before introduced the European world,¹ was alien to the thoroughly practical, and in this respect Jewish mind of Ewald. The Song of Songs is to him not the work of a theosophist—that is too high a view, nor yet is it a mere collection of love-poems—that is too low a view; it “is one whole, and constitutes a sort of popular drama, or, more correctly speaking, a cantata,” describing the victory of true love, and thus, without the least sign of conscious purpose, promoting the highest ends of morality. This is not one of Ewald’s greatest works. He had several predecessors, especially Umbreit, who had recently defended the unity of the Song of Songs in a way which called forth the high approval of the illustrious author of the *Westöstliche Diván*. He is doubtless too in-

¹ *Ssufismus s. theosophia Persarum pantheistica*, 1821. Comp. Vaughan’s *Hours with the Mystics*, vol. ii.

genious in restoring what he thinks the proper form of the poem, and yet, though neither in this nor in any other book of Ewald has the last word of criticism been spoken, his very freshly written first edition marks a real step in the explanation of the Song.

All this was most creditable work, but not enough for an aspirant to the chair of Eichhorn. There was an older scholar who had strong claims on the appointment, himself a pupil of Eichhorn, and a former Göttingen Repe- tent, Wilhelm Gesenius, at that time professor at Halle. The too general and æsthetic treatment of the Old Testa- ment, introduced by Herder, was profoundly repugnant to this somewhat dry commentator, but most accomplished master of the Semitic languages. Herder was for soaring into the infinite; Gesenius was perfectly satisfied with the finite. Ewald had in his nature something of both, re- minding us of those lines of Goethe :

Willst du in's Unendliche schreiten,
Geh nur in's Endliche nach allen Seiten.

Ewald might well expect that the chair of Eichhorn would be offered, as in point of fact it was in the first instance, to Gesenius, but he would also seek to strengthen his own claims by competing with that scholar on his own ground. Great as were the merits of Gesenius's Hebrew grammar, or rather grammars, from the point of view of the learner—their clearness and simplicity, in fact, left nothing to be wished—there was still a demand for a grammar more independent in its relation to the older systems, more philosophic in its explanations, more in harmony with the scientific principles of Franz Bopp and his distinguished colleagues. As an English friend and pupil of Ewald said in 1835, “The elements of a further development of Hebrew grammar were already ripening in silence; but the honour of effecting the reformation was

reserved for Prof. Ewald.”¹ The *Kritische Grammatik* (1827) at once drew all eyes upon its author, and it may safely be said that with this book in his hand he won his professorship. Gesenius himself had no mean jealousy of his young rival; in 1826 he had even sent one of his most promising pupils to Göttingen to complete his studies under Ewald, who, he said, was “ein exquisiter Hebräer, auch ein selten gelehrter Araber.”² In 1828, hungry for fresh distinction, Ewald actually brought out a second Hebrew grammar, “in vollständiger Kürze bearbeitet,” which appeared in 1835 in a second edition, thoroughly revised, as the preface states, and greatly improved. The most important addition consists of a treatise on the accents, based upon a previous essay of Ewald’s published in 1832 in his *Abhandlungen zur Oriental. u. Bibl. Litteratur* (part 1; a second part was never issued), in which the relationship of the Hebrew to the simpler Syriac accentuation is pointed out. Throughout his life Ewald continued to improve his grammar, to which in 1844 he gave the title *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. The earlier editions are however of much historical interest, and a few passages from the preface to Ewald’s second Hebrew grammar may be quoted, as illustrative not only of the views of the author, but of his modesty at this point of his career. He is speaking of the new period in the study of Hebrew grammar. “I myself may have only the merit of the first impulse to improvement, if even that may be called a merit, since the idea of an improvement in this science is less owing to me than the claims of our time, and this idea has perhaps only been awakened somewhat sooner and more vividly in me. Even after the firmer form which I have

¹ Preface to the English translation of Ewald’s Hebrew Grammar, by John Nicholson (Lond., 1836), p. xi.

² *Wilhelm Vatke, in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften*, von H. Benecke, p. 27.

been able to give the Hebrew grammar in this new work, there nevertheless remains, as I partly confidently believe and partly suspect, much for future inquirers, or, perhaps, for myself to add or to define more strictly, not only in the syntax, which follows logical laws and is therefore more easily thoroughly understood by a consistent thinker, but also in the doctrine of the sounds of the language.”¹

It is no part of my plan to estimate with precision the services of Ewald to Hebrew grammar. The very interesting preface of Dr. John Nicholson to his translation of the second edition of the *Grammatik*, well describes some of the most valuable characteristics of the book, and the impression which they produced on acute and well-prepared students like himself. Other schools of grammarians have arisen since Ewald's time, and his successors can certainly not afford to imitate him in what König calls the assertive style. Much which Ewald in his later years considered himself to have settled, has now become very properly a subject of debate. But the stimulus which he has given to the study of Hebrew grammar is immense, and a general indebtedness, visible in most if not all of his successors, is quite consistent with many differences in points of detail. You will not accuse me of speaking as a partisan. Even in that part of Ewald's grammar which I admire most—the syntax—I cannot follow him unreservedly. But by his devotion to Hebrew grammar he is worthy to be set up as a model to future interpreters. The Hebrew writers have too often been regarded in England as almost incapable of consecutive thought, and the atomistic mode of treating the Bible is now so deeply rooted as to have become an enemy to the popular religious life. Is there any better means of correcting this evil than by a thorough study of

¹ Nicholson's translation (see above), p. xiii.

Hebrew syntax on the part of those who are called upon to be theological or religious teachers? Now that we have not only Ewald's Syntax translated, but a special English monograph on the use of the tenses, which needs not to be recommended here, there can, at least for many of us, be no valid excuse for ignorance of the subject. I at any rate, as an appointed teacher of exegesis, hold myself in no way bound to the Authorized or Revised Version, but by continuous exegesis on the principles of Ewald, will do my best to roll away what has too long been a national reproach.

This was what Ewald, more than any other man, did for Germany. I do not, of course, say that his interest in grammar was solely theological. He loved grammar for its own sake, as the most wonderful product of the human faculties. To Arabic grammar he devoted himself at first with almost as much zeal as to Hebrew grammar; and the pages of his linguistic works¹ testify to his keen interest in the most outlying languages, from which indeed he often drew illustrations for Hebrew. The composition of his Arabic grammar (vol. i. 1831; vol. ii. 1833) falls between the first and second editions of the second or smaller Hebrew grammars, and must have contributed greatly to the improvement of the latter work. The book is written in very clumsy Latin, but contains much interesting matter for a Hebraist or a comparative philologist, its object being not merely to register phenomena, but to give simple and consistent explanations.

The author never had leisure for a second edition, in which perhaps he would have given more detailed criticism of the Arabic grammarians. Writing the book was a recreation. From Arabic grammar, from the *Mu'allaqât* and the *Qur'ân*, he returned with renewed energies to Hebrew

¹ See especially the two first of his *Sprachwissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen*, 1861-62.

grammar, to the psalmists and the prophets of the Bible.

I speak of this as a return, for you will remember that Ewald is already well known to Biblical scholars. Both on Hebrew grammar and on Hebrew poetry he has published results which have been found worth hearing. A grand ideal beckons him onward, but he has the self-restraint to listen to the warnings of an inner voice, which bids him proceed slowly, *ohne Hast ohne Rast*, trusting that God will grant him time enough to finish his work. In 1826 he began the investigation of the poetical books; in 1835 he resumes this by the publication of a book on the Psalms, which is followed in 1836 by Job, and in 1837 by Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. These volumes form parts 2-4 of a series called *Die poetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes*; the first part, containing introductory matter on Hebrew poetry in general and on the Book of Psalms in particular, did not appear till 1839. He takes, you see, a different line from that recommended by Abraham Kuenen. He thinks it safest to begin his Old Testament researches, not with the prophets, but with the poets, as bringing us nearer to the primitive spiritual forces at work amidst the people of Israel. Thus he hopes to gain a vantage-point for comprehending as well the far loftier speech of the prophets, as the recollections of the spiritual movement (using the word "spiritual" in a wide sense) of Israel's bygone times recorded in the historical books.¹ There is something to be said for this plan. That peculiar spiritual state which we call inspiration is less distinctly visible in the poetical than in the prophetic books; not less truly, but less distinctly visible; and it is perhaps a good exercise to study this

¹ See p. vi. of *Vorrede* to *Die poetischen Bücher*. Compare Ewald's view of the right plan for those who would read the Bible for instruction, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, i. 465-6. Here again note Ewald's consistency from youth to age.

phenomenon first of all as displayed upon the frankly human and popular groundwork of poetical compositions. The only danger is that such a course is liable to prejudice the investigator unduly in favour of an early date for the poetical books; for if these books are very late, they seem to become a mere reflection of prophecy, a sort of substitute for the living oracle. It was, at any rate, very unwise of Ewald to hamper his future course as a critic by venturing thus early on a chronological rearrangement of the psalms. It is however, in my opinion, much to his credit that he recognises so fully a large captivity and post-captivity element in the Psalter. In fact, he stands aloof both from the extreme conservative and from the extreme liberal party; nearer, however, as could easily be shown, to the former than to the latter. The fault of the book is of course its fragmentariness. But as a supplement to other works, it still has its use. Ewald's view of the connexion of thought in the psalms is always worth considering, and his emotional sympathy with the psalmists is altogether unique.

But I think that his book on Job is, if not greater, yet more complete and freer from faults. If we look at the translation, how many brilliant examples of grammatical tact occur to us! while the commentary shows equal skill in tracing out the often subtle connexions between the speeches. The introduction is brimfull of insight, and stimulates even where it fails to convince, and Ewald's "higher criticism" is here, I think, for once final and authoritative. The study of the wonderful character-drama of Job has, I trust, a great future before it, but only on condition of our starting from the point where Ewald has left it. I cannot stop to speak of his Proverbs and Ecclesiastes—works less fruitful, as it seems to me, in suggestions of permanent value; and of the opening volume of the series I can only give the general verdict of Biblical scholars

that, putting aside the meagre pages on the Psalms, strange to say, the only part accessible in English,¹ it is one of Ewald's most original and satisfactory works.

But now to return to the personal history of the author. We have seen him in his greatness; we are soon to sympathize with him in his trials and infirmities. He has had the discipline of prosperity, but has shown a strong imaginative sympathy with those in the depths of affliction. The *Book of the Trial of the Righteous One* has found in him a congenial interpreter; soon the question of the poem is to come back to him with a personal application, "Dost thou serve God for nought?" Looking back on this early period, Ewald was in the habit of idealizing it, just as the patriarch idealized the "months of old" in that most touching elegiac retrospect, the 29th chapter of Job. Still there is no doubt that Ewald was more firmly rooted in Göttingen, and his relations with scholars both in and out of Göttingen more agreeable at this time than afterwards. A truly noble band of professors, especially historical professors, illustrated the *Georgia Augusta*. There was Lücke the commentator on St. John and Church-historian, Gieseler the Church-historian, Dahlmann the historian of Greece, Ritter the historian of philosophy, Gervinus the historian of literature, Otfried Müller the archæologist, Jakob Grimm the Germanist; among others may be added the two friends, Weber the great electrician and Gauss the celebrated mathematician, the latter of whom in 1830 became Ewald's father-in-law. None of these was more distinguished than Heinrich Ewald. Honours crowded upon him; he had large classes, attracted by his enthusiasm and his thoroughness, and exercised a wide and salutary influence on the critical movement.

True, there was already a root of bitterness in his self-

¹ Dr. Nicholson's translation of the general introductory portion is buried in the Old Series of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

concentration. That same spiritual "recluseness" which, in the words of Edward Irving, led "that soul of every excellence, the glorious Milton" into "the greatest of all intolerance,"¹ was the bane of Ewald. He had a noble and unselfish ambition, but he had it too absorbingly. It bade him "separate himself" from his kind and "intermeddle with all wisdom,"² forgetting that more than one prophet is wanted to accomplish a Divine purpose, and that he himself, no less than Eichhorn, needed the support of independent fellow-workers. At first there was only a vague danger that a naïve self-confidence might develop into a tormenting intolerance. His expressions of feeling were too childlike to irritate, and as yet he left the world and its rulers to take care of themselves.³ In 1836 however there are indications of a change; the conclusion of the fourth part of *Die poetischen Bücher* contains, among much very interesting matter, full of rude but striking eloquence, a very painful attack on that sweet-natured, conscientious, and gifted scholar, De Wette. Ewald had, it seems, been spending a holiday in Italy, but it was a holiday against his will; his mind preyed upon itself, and even the historical treasures of the Eternal City gave out no balm for his wounded spirit. Ancient art scarcely speaks to him; he writes epigrams in verse,⁴ breathing a Luther-like scorn of the Romans and their Church, and of those who, tempted by false promises, have become converts to Rome. Except where his faith darts upwards, as for instance in the last lines, which remind us of Arthur Clough's "Say not the struggle nought availeth," his pen is dipped in gall, and he seeks a much-needed excuse in some wrong which has been done him at home. I cannot

¹ *Miscellanies from the Writings of Irving*, p. 153.

² Prov. xviii. 1, A. V. I need not criticize the translation.

³ "Ich schrieb dort mit leichtem um die Welt bekümmertem Sinne." *Die poet. Bücher des A. B.*, Bd. I. Vorrede, S. viii.

⁴ "Mussestunden in Italien," *Ibid.*, iv. 231-246.

myself understand his obscure allusion to a "speech of tyrannous cruelty," but certain it is that in the following year a grievous wrong did befall him, which threatened for an indefinite period to thrust into idleness—"in thatenlose Musse zu versetzen"—one whose spirit was wholly academical, and who viewed with perfect justice even his authorship as an outgrowth of his professional position. In 1833, as a consequence of the attempted revolution of 1831, King William gave his sanction to a *Staatsgrundgesetz* or Constitutional Statute; in 1837 King Ernest Augustus signalized his accession to the throne by refusing to recognise this as binding. It was an event which deeply stirred academic society, and not to Otfried Müller alone may these words of a scholar-poet be applied :

Und als der Donner zürnend eingeschlagen,
Wer hat den Muth mit tapferm Wort erregt,
Dem Manneswort: "So wir uns selbst nicht fehlen,
Wie mag uns Furcht vor Drang und Unbill quälen?"¹

But what could academical teachers do, knights of the pen and not of the sword? Seven at any rate found their duty clear; they addressed a solemn protest to the Curators of the University at Hanover. Their names deserve to be chronicled; Dahlmann was the leader, the others were the two Grimms, Gervinus, Weber, Albrecht, and the subject of this sketch. The consequences were serious for themselves, for in December of the same year they were all dismissed from their office. Upon Ewald, not merely a patriot, but essentially a provincial, the blow fell with double force. No exile ever felt his banishment more. For the moment he found occupation in the English libraries;³ but it seemed at first as if the Guelphic bann

¹ From a memorial poem on Karl Otfried Müller, by Dr. Ellissen, Hellenist and Liberal politician.

² This is strictly accurate. Blenheim could not tempt him from the Bodleian. Some of his Oxford acquisitions are to be found in vol. i. of *Beiträge zur ältesten Auslegung des A. T.*, by Ewald and Dukes. Stuttgart, 1844.

were to exclude him and his friends from academical office anywhere. Fortunately indeed such fears were groundless; the reputation of the seven professors was as much enhanced by a protest against arbitrary power as that of our own seven bishops, and Ewald was the first to receive an appointment.

Ewald's call to Tübingen in 1838 opens a fresh chapter in his history; it brought him, we must add, face to face with his second great trial. Would the recluse scholar be enriched or impoverished by transplantation? Would he catch something of the characteristic warmth of Wurtemberg religious life, and communicate in return that earnestness and questioning reasonableness which he had inherited from his fathers? And looking to his new university relations, would the man who could so well give their due to the different types of teaching in the Bible show equal flexibility in dealing with a colleague so unlike himself as Ferdinand C. Baur? It was a difficult position for Ewald. Even Carl Hase, as he has told us in his charming autobiography, found it a work of time to get thoroughly naturalized in Schwabenland. One so awkward as Ewald in social intercourse, and so conscious of his own merits, could not but experience in some respects even greater hindrances than Hase. He was thus thrown back more than ever on himself, and his old infirmities gathered such a head that they made life a burden both to himself and to others. He had even before 1837 begun to express himself with unjustifiable positiveness on the errors of contemporary theologians, not indeed as a rule mentioning their names; but after that date things went from worse to worse. The fundamental differences between himself and Baur seemed to him to demand an ever-renewed protest on his part.¹ I need not say how painful such a feud

¹ Contrast the respectful language of Dörner and Ullmann to Baur at this same period.

between colleagues must have been, and I have no doubt that, even more than in the case of Ewald's quarrel with Gesenius, the fault was on Ewald's side. But indeed no one was safe from this self-appointed censor. The English nation came off best; but our own Pusey, who never retaliated on Ewald, had the fortune to be joined with Hengstenberg and Delitzsch in the same unqualified condemnation. Political errors, too, were now equally obnoxious to Ewald, as a political martyr, with theological. With unmeasured violence, but without any of that wit which redeems the violence of great satirists, he chastised by turns most of "the powers that be," and when no notice was taken, it was a proof to him that he was in the right. Alas for a true prophet who mistook his functions, to the injury not only of his own fame, but of the truth which it was his privilege to make known! Alas, that instead of gratefully learning wherever he could, and appreciating high moral purpose, when he could do no more, he at once rejected all but his own results, and imputed intellectual divergences to moral defects! "Woe to that study," says the gentle Spenser's too fiery friend, Gabriel Harvey, "that mispendeth pretious Time, and consumeth itself in needlesse and bootlesse quarrels."¹ For Ewald's "railing accusations" were fully avenged on Ewald himself. Had he but taken his proper place as an honoured member of Truth's household, how much more would he have effected, and how much more easily could we estimate the comparative value of his work!²

I have omitted as yet to mention one great blow which

¹ *Four Letters, and certaine Sonnets, etc.* (1592), p. 27.

² The controversial treatises of Carl Wex and August Knobel may be here mentioned, the one entitled *Herr Prof. Ewald als Panier gewürdigt* (1843), the other *Exegetisches Vademecum für Herr Prof. Ewald* (1844). Literature of this kind justifies the remark of a French-Swiss scholar, "Les philologues allemands du xix^{me} siècle ont souvent le tempérament aussi batailleur et la critique aussi âpre que les érudits de la Renaissance" (pref. to Pictet's *Les origines indoeuropéennes*).

befell Ewald, too great to be referred to in the middle of a paragraph. It removed from his side the one softening influence which remained to him in his banishment. In 1840 his wife died, a more serious loss to him, as he himself says, than any of which his foes had been the cause. His only comfort was in high ideas, and he became more and more sensitive to any supposed disparagement of them. He had quenched his burning thirst for religious truth at the fountain of the Bible, and it both grieved¹ and angered him when some critic of large gifts misused them, as he thought, to the detriment of the Bible—that is, of Ewald's opinions about the Bible. It is true that the grief in Ewald's mind was too commonly overpowered by the indignation. But, we may ask, have there been no instances of this confusion of truth with opinion, and of intellectual error with moral obliquity among critics of another school and divines of another Church? If I had a right to be intolerant of the intolerant, I would quote those words of the ancient seer :

O my soul, come not thou into their council ;
Unto their assembly, O my glory, be not thou united.²

In Ewald's case, however, this inability to do justice to other workers detracts in only a slight degree from the comfort of the reader, for as a rule he confines controversial allusions to his prefaces. None of his writings is more bathed in the peace and sanctity of the spiritual world than the two volumes on the Prophets, which appeared in the opening years of the bitter Tübingen period. What can I say that would be sufficient of this grand work, the treasures of which are still far from exhausted, and which, as a specimen of exegesis, has extorted the admiration of

¹ "Ich möchte vergehen vor Schmerz, sehend dass ein so armseliger Zustand von Exegese von Männern fortgesetzt wird, welche vielleicht Besseres leisten könnten." *Die poet. Bücher*, IV. (1837), p. 253.

² Gen. xlix. 6.

a critic who so much dislikes Ewald's believingness as Eduard Meyer?¹ Full and free as is my own appreciation of Gesenius, Knobel, and especially Kuenen, I cannot help noticing in Ewald's *Die Propheten* a power of sympathetically reproducing primitive experiences, *Nachempfinden*, as the Germans call it, which is altogether unique, and which I ascribe partly to Ewald's possession of a deep spiritual theistic religion, uncoloured and undistorted by non-Semitic formulæ, partly to that peculiar personal experience which I have ventured to call, by analogy, prophetic. The first edition of the work appeared in 1840 and 1841; the second only in 1867—an instance of self-restraint and noble dissatisfaction which may mitigate our disapproval of the author's dogmatism. "Not as though I had attained," he seems to say, "either were already perfected." The two editions deserve to be compared; philologically, I am not sure that all Ewald's corrections are improvements; though the study of the higher criticism is in several ways advanced by the new edition. But let all of us theological students, however strong our prejudices against the critical analysis of ancient texts, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest that noble introduction which, by what might seem a miracle, deals evenhanded justice both to rational criticism and to the realities of faith.

T. K. CHEYNE.

¹ *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i. (1884), p. 204.

SOME GLEANINGS FROM ST. PETER'S
HARVEST-FIELD.

III.

A CHRISTIAN WOMAN AND A WICKED WOMAN: A
CONTRAST.

“A meek and quiet spirit.”—1 PETER iii. 4.

“Having eyes full of an adulteress, and that cannot cease from sin.”—2 PETER ii. 14.

KEBLE speaks of Scripture as the

“Eye of God’s word, where’er we turn
Ever upon us.”

and he refers us to a once famous volume of sermons, where the preacher describes this penetrating influence of the Bible as “the eye, like that of a portrait, fixed uniformly upon us, whenever we turn.”¹ Perhaps these powerful lines are especially true of such brief summaries of human character as I have selected for specimens of one characteristic power of St. Peter’s Epistles. I have chosen them purposely from the most opposite extremes in the wide range of human character—from the finest portraiture of regenerate womanhood and the lowest depths of unsanctified manhood.

I. The portrait of Christian womanhood is one very dear to English Christians.

“In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behaviour of their wives; beholding your chaste behaviour coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner aforetime the holy women also, who hoped in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection

¹ Miller’s *Bampton Lectures*.

to their own husbands: as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose children ye now are, if ye do well, and are not put in fear by any terror." ¹

The "chaste conversation coupled with fear" seems to signify purity in an atmosphere of fear,² the tremulous grace which is "afraid of the very shadow of wrong." The "beholding" is in the original a remarkable word. It seems to point at "initiation" into a world of goodness before unknown to the husband.³ The selfish rhetorician Libanius, who had some Christian acquaintances, is said to have exclaimed—"what wives those Christians have!" A missionary to China has heard Chinese Christian women say—"until we became Christians, we never really knew that we were women."

The description in the third verse has that rush of accumulated synonyms significantly varied, that threefold stroke, which we have previously mentioned as a characteristic of St. Peter. We have the hair plaited, and as the Romans would say, "built up and turreted"; the clasping round of golden ornaments⁴ and chains for the head, the neck, the wrist, the finger; the putting on effectively of beautiful, well-made, and no doubt expensive clothes. All this more than half contemptuous piling of words well conveys to us the long business of an elaborate toilette, the scented atmosphere of flattery and not altogether innocent frivolity. "In the incorruptible apparel of *the* meek and quiet spirit,"⁵ because meek inwardly in the affections, therefore moving in an atmosphere of quiet, with gentle words, looks and acts. The preciousness of any gem can only be rightly estimated by the connoisseur. Thus the ruby of six carats is said to be worth six thousand pounds,

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 1-7.

² Abp. Leighton: ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆς (ver. 2). Cf. Phil. ii. 12; Jude 13.

³ ἐποπτεύσαντες.

⁴ Literally, "of putting round of golden jewels."

⁵ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος (ver. 4).

about fifteen times more than a diamond of the same weight. But "the price of the virtuous woman is far above rubies"¹ in the sight of God, who alone truly estimates the value of hearts. The last verse of our passage teaches us that Christians should possess the qualities of activity in good works, and superiority to half-affected hysterical weakness. The words "whose daughters ye *became*" may point to the fact that among these opulent ladies were Gentile converts, and not exclusively women of Hebrew lineage.²

The saints in all ages have allowed themselves to be sarcastic about dress. Isaiah was so, and St. Paul,³ and St. Peter. Jerome is angrier and fiercer. To Læta he writes, "Load not your child's hair with gems, nor sprinkle on her young head some of the red fire of hell."⁴

All this was never meant to forbid appropriate womanly dress. A true poet profoundly placed "want of *vanity*" among the signs of degradation. Certainly dress should not be extravagant, either in the *means* lavished upon it, or in the *time* devoted to it, or in the *taste* which it exhibits. Do not people speak of "*loud* dress"? I suppose that by this is meant a discord in shape, a shock in colours, a flashy advertisement, to say—"the wearer is very foolish, but with a kind of folly which is not very innocent."

Here then was St. Peter's ideal of Christian womanhood; and remember that this picture was drawn when Poppæa was the wife of Nero.

One word should be added. It may be true that there is an almost ferociously self-asserting purity, which is different from that quiet whiteness of soul whereof the Apostle

¹ Prov. xxxi. 10.

² Note, (1) Sarah, a princess, called Abraham "her lord," incidentally and naturally, in speaking to herself (Gen. xviii. 12); (2) St. Paul had pointed the Galatians to the type of Sarah (Gal. iv. 22, 31).

³ Isa. iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 9.

⁴ "Nec caput gemmis oneres, nec capillum irrufes, et ei aliquod de gehennæ ignibus auspicieris."—S. Hieron ad Lætam, *De Institut. Filie*.

writes. There may be some ground for complaints of the shrieking sisterhood and of platform women. But there is a shrieking brotherhood, and there are platform men. Nor, again, is every gentle-mannered woman really gentle. Non-chalance is not necessarily meekness. There is a quietness which is the effluence of dulness rather than of sweetness. There is an acrid obstinacy of silence that stabs deeper than any stiletto of language which wit ever pointed.

Still there *are* women who are called upon to minister to Christ in particular works, which man could never do—women who, when speak they must, speak with no professional platform swagger, but with the gentle power of Christian love. A golden line of prophetesses runs through the texture of Scripture—Miriam, Hannah, Deborah, Huldah, the daughters of Philip the Evangelist. Why should we suppose that there are no prophetesses now? They see bleeding wounds; they ask to staunch them. May our daughters thus prophesy, and the Spirit of God be thus poured on His handmaidens.¹ Earth is better and softer for the visions which float in that holy dream-land.

This ideal of womanhood has passed into the heart of Christendom. It has softened and purified art, poetry,² romance. It has done something better. It has blessed humble homes. Think of the women who nurse the sick

¹ Acts ii. 17, 18.

² Many will remember Wordsworth's "Lucy."

"She dwelt among the untrodden ways,
Beside the springs of Dove;
A maiden there were few to praise,
And very few to love.

"A violet by a mossy stone,
Half hidden from the eye;
Fair as a star when only one
Is shining in the sky.

"She lived unknown, and few could know
When Lucy ceased to be;
But she is in her grave, and oh!
The difference to me."

in poor homes; who look after children tenderly, who are "loving and amiable, faithful and obedient to their husbands." They have one reward here,—love. Not always at once. Yet at last, when the poor tried one lies down with a shadow on her face, there comes a softened memory of purity, affection, quietness, self-denial, frugality. The hardest and most material man softens as he thinks of that subtle arithmetic of love which enabled her to make three or four live more cheaply than one could ever manage to do when he was alone. Surely there is in this something that comes from Christ, and perpetuates itself in successive generations—"the ornament of the meek and quiet spirit."

One more suggestion may be made. St. Peter, the Apostle of Christ, was "himself a married man." We are told by a very ancient writer,¹ that, seeing his wife Petronella led to death, the husband in all his anguish was enabled to rejoice, because she was called by God and going home. "And he spake to her by her name, and comforted her, saying, 'my wife, remember the Lord.'" Was this the original of this engaging picture?

II. We now turn to a terribly contrasted picture. "Having eyes full of an *adulteress*."² All who possess eyes at all have them full of something. I have heard one of exquisite æsthetic sensibility, who had seen some of the glorious painted glass at St. Gudule, in Brussels, on a summer day, declare that for days his eyes were "full of those colours, especially the blue." The eye of the woman of "meek and quiet spirit," wherever circumstances may lead her, is full of love. Even so the sensualist's eye is "full of an adulteress," filled full, so that it can hold no more.

This description forms one of the premisses of a tremendous moral syllogism whose conclusion is next given. Every sensual thought, every eye-full of an adulteress, is sin; but

¹ Clem. Alex., *Ap. Eusebius*.

² *μεστὸς μοιχαλίδος*.

the sensualist's eye is always full of an adulteress ; therefore, he never can be made thoroughly to rest from sin. The eyes are fixed in an evil expression which they can never lose. They give signal to all whom it concerns that they are ever on the watch. That which is choke-full often means in the original, satiated. But such eyes are insatiate and insatiable.

This is one of God's terrible voices of moral judgment, one of those hints which tell us what a man may become. Let us consider that law of human *character* which is the foundation of the law of Divine *punishment* ; without which, indeed, the latter cannot be spiritually construed to the spiritual nature.

*Character*¹ then, as the derivation of the word implies, has a tendency to become, and frequently does become, absolutely stereotyped, from a practical point of view. Generally speaking, up to a certain date, a man may issue a second edition of his moral life, revised and corrected, perhaps even entirely recast. Still, a day comes when the second edition, with the "errata" expunged, is not possible any longer. Many of us have known at college or in society, a man in early life remarkable for pleasant manner and exuberant gaiety. Suddenly in the streets, or at a railway station, we are confronted with an abject creature, who, in a tone at once cringing and bitter, addresses us by name, and asks for the loan of half-a-crown, until his remittance arrives. Such as he is, such will he be, until the day when he dies of "delirium tremens," and finds a pauper's grave. Of all the conceptions of fiction, none impresses us so awfully as the scene when Lady Macbeth passes across the stage with a taper. "Hell is murky. . . . What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to

¹ *χαρακτήρ* is, in the first instance, a graving tool ; next, the mark engraved, especially figures or letters ; hence, distinctive note of language, style, or disposition.

account? What! will these hands ne'er be clean?—No more o' that, my lord, no more o' that; you mar all with this starting. . . . Here's the smell of the blood still; all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."¹ All the history of her soul is summed up in those five words, "what's done cannot be undone"; all our natural yearning (for there is a tendency in the sight of these tremendous spectacles of irremediable sin and inevitable punishment to drive us into universalism), in five other words spoken by a by-stander—"God, God, forgive us all!" Such persons are in time embodiments of hell, and the idea of eternal condemnation forces itself upon us as a reality. In that grief there is only anguish, but no desire after good. She still maintains firmly the evil will, and the good is in her only as a capacity which cannot be separated from creatures made in God's image. When we see her thus wandering, is it not just as she still must wander through eternity, weeping the tearless weeping of hell, of which we are reminded in the words, "ye mountains fall on us, ye hills cover us"?² So is the text fulfilled "he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still."³ The words of St. Peter upon which we meditate seems to afford us a glimpse into the fissure which is cleft below every human life.

We live in an age when men generally mistake wishes for wants, and the cloudland of plausible speculation for the solidity of fact. It is sought to suppress truth by making it unpopular, and then calling for a division upon it. "What! a finite passing sin, an infinite eternal punishment! The dogma confutes itself by the indignation which it rouses in an unsophisticated mind."

Let it be granted, then, that single sins are passing sins, not interwoven with the whole contexture of a man's

¹ Macbeth, Act v. scene i.

² See one of the greatest passages in modern theology, in Bishop Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, § 286.

³ Apoc. xxii. 11.

being. But what if some lives of sin, some habits of evil doing and worse thinking are not transient and temporary, as a matter of fact? The Psalmist expresses with wonderful power that conviction of the spiritual nature, elevated by worship, whereby it feels and knows itself to be immortal.

"I will sing to the Lord in my life.

I will lift up psalms to my God,

While my soul can call itself *I*!"¹

What if the sinner make his eye and his soul so full of sin, that sin can no more pass from him than existence. If the righteous is eternal, his praise must be eternal also; it is inseparable from his existence. If the sinner is eternal, his sin is eternal also.

This is our Lord's teaching about one form, or stage of sin, as restored to us by the Revised Version, "is guilty of an eternal sin."² If the man lives after life, he carries with him not the temporary sin which he may have done alone, but the eternal sin of will and thought which he will do. His punishment is not simply for what he *has done*, but for what he *is*, not for the transitory sin *here*, but for the eternal sin *there*. He is "guilty of eternal sin." The eye once "full of an adulteress" may be filled with dust, but the ineradicable image has been carried to, and abides for ever in, that "inward eye," which is the "bliss" or bane, the heaven or hell of "solitude."

This is a solemn argument for youth when the vapour of imagination and passion are beginning to condense into habit; for that portion of manhood during which habit is becoming of insoluble density. Let us beware of the lust of the eyes. Far from us be the questionable book; the shameful chronicle of the newspaper; the prurient picture; the dangerous stimulant of visible objects: the thought

¹ Psalm civ. 33. בְּעוֹרִי, lit. "during me." See *Witness to the Psalms*, p. 380 (2nd edition).

² ἐνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος. Mark iii. 29.

which the tender conscience knows should be sternly challenged, before allowing it to pass into the citadel of the soul. Be ours the prayer, "turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity; and quicken Thou me in Thy way."¹ Nor let *any* who ponders this argument turn from it with a sigh of despair, "for *me* it is too late." If we have enough of will left to desire earnestly a new mind, it is *not* too late. Such can still hear the voice—"him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out."²

May we not well pray: "Lord! let sin, which is the very hell of hell, fade from mine eyes, and let them be filled with Thee who art the very heaven of heaven. Cause them to see the light of Thy glory, and the beauty of Thy face. Be present with me in joy and sorrow, in pleasure and business, at the altar and by the hearth, all day and all night. Where Thou art, Thou art seen. Thou Who art invisible, art seen seen invisibly by that nature which is also invisible in us, a heart purified by the Spirit."³ Where Thou dwellest, the eye is pure and the soul ceases from sin." "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus."

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

THE BOOK OF JOB.—I.

THE Revision has effected changes in the rendering of the Book of Job more numerous and more important perhaps than in any other book. Many of the changes, which are but slight in themselves, and the influence of which would

¹ Ps. cxix. 37.

² John vi. 37.

³ S. Aug., *Epist.*, cxlviii.

not be felt in other books of Scripture beyond their immediate context, from the fact that the Book of Job has more unity than most books, colour or alter our view of the whole complexion of the poem. Thus in chap. xiv. 14, the change of "will" into "would"—"all the days of my warfare would I wait till my change should come"—besides giving a consistent meaning to the passage, enables us to perceive more clearly the views regarding a future life with which Job began his great struggle, and to estimate more accurately the advance which he made during it. No doubt the "will I wait" of the A.V. has been allowed a place in the margin. This is a specimen of a class of margins that deserve the attention the reader less than others. In very many instances where a new rendering has been introduced into the text, and the A.V. permitted to occupy a place in the margin, it may be presumed that, in addition to some plausibility in behalf of the A.V., the fact that it was the A.V. was allowed, perhaps unconsciously, to weigh somewhat in its favour. It is probable that the next revision, whenever it shall come, will sweep many of this class of margins away. On the other hand, the margins which present an alternative rendering to the A.V., without displacing it, will very generally be found to be instructive.

The alterations made in this part of Scripture are so numerous that it will not be possible to call attention to them all. Only the more important of them, chiefly those which have some bearing on the scope or general conceptions of the book, need be noticed.

In the first two prose chapters there was little room for emendation. The expression, "cursed" God in their hearts, "curse" Thee to Thy face, has been changed in all the passages where it occurs (i. 5, 11; ii. 5, 8) to "re-nounce." In the original the word means usually "to bless." There are no doubt in the Shemitic languages words which have such contradictory senses, but there is

no probability that this term "bless" is one of them. It is more likely that the expression, being used in saying farewell, came to have the meaning "to bid adieu to," and hence further "to renounce." Such a slight advance in meaning is common both in the classical and modern languages: "*valeat res ludicra*," good-bye the stage (Hor.); "*si maxime talis est Deus ut . . . nulla hominum caritate teneatur valeat*"—farewell to him (Cic.). In the only similar passage, 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13, the word "curse" has been put in the text, and "renounce" as an alternative placed in the margin.

In i. 22 R.V. renders, "In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God with foolishness." The A.V., "nor charged God foolishly," had its antidote already in the old margin, "nor attributed folly to God." This was the form which Job's sin, if he had sinned, would have taken—he would have imputed folly, lit. insipidity to God, that is, a want of right moral flavour, or wrong in His conduct of men's history and of the world. This was the sin to which Job was being driven, which he probably in the heat of conflict committed, though not in the degree or manner, or at least not with the consequences, which the Satan predicted. In ii. 8 the A.V. missed the graphic touch of the original, "he took a potsherd to scrape himself withal; and he sat down among the ashes," which should be, "as he sat among," etc. The last clause describes the position in which he already was when he took the potsherd to scrape himself. R.V. has merely omitted "down," and scarcely suggests at once the state of things.

In Job's opening speech, chap. iii., there are at least two important changes. Of minor alterations, "the night which said," for "the night in which it was said" (v. 3), is a gain, restoring the poetry of the passage. "They hear not the voice of the taskmaster" (v. 18) is at once more precise and suggestive than "the oppressor" of A.V. "Let

darkness and the shadow of death claim it for their own" (v. 5), takes the place of the unmeaning "stain it" of A.V., though nothing more than modern phraseology for the old margin, "challenge it."

The change in v. 8, however, is important: "let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready to rouse up leviathan," instead of "ready to raise up their mourning" of the A.V. The passage contains one of the many mythological allusions in the book. To curse the day and to rouse up leviathan mean the same thing. Leviathan was the fabled dragon or serpent that swallowed up the sun or moon, or wound himself about them, obscuring their light and inducing the blackness of the day (v. 5). Enchanters were credited with power to set this dragon in motion. Such a curse Job invokes upon the night of his conception. The rendering of A.V. is really without meaning, while the new sense fits precisely into the passage. Such a mythological play might seem out of harmony with the despairing earnestness of Job. But, apart from the fact that what seems but an imaginative play to us may have contained some elements of reality to him, it is not uncharacteristic of the mind not only keenly to analyse its own despair or affliction, but also to subject it to the play of the intellect.

The other important alteration occurs in the last two verses of the chapter, where the past tenses of A.V. have given place to presents, and the passage is seen to refer to Job's condition of affliction at the moment when he spoke. "The thing which I greatly feared is come upon me," of A.V., would necessarily refer to the period of Job's life before his calamities befel him, and would suggest that even during his time of prosperity he was uneasy and haunted by apprehensions of impending evil. But such an idea would run counter to the whole scope of the book, according to which Job's calamities were wholly unexpected

by him and inexplicable, as well as to his own express words: "I said I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand" (xxix. 18, and the whole of that chap.). The alteration, though slight in itself, removes an obstacle to the general understanding of the poem, and helps to bring all its parts into harmony with one another.

The fine opening speech of Eliphaz (chap. iv.-v.) has required little retouching, its great beauty lying largely in its simplicity. The very slight alteration required by grammar in v. 2, "if one assay," for the former "if we assay," suggests better Eliphaz's feeling of the tact necessary to handle Job, and the delicacy to be observed in approaching him. A more important emendation occurs in v. 6, where A.V. has, "Is not this thy fear, thy confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways?"—a combination of words rather baffling to the natural understanding. The syntax of the original is somewhat unusual, but R.V., "Is not thy fear *of God* thy confidence, and thy hope the integrity of thy ways?" gives the sense required in the connexion, and is doubtless right. In v. 15, a "spirit" passed before my face, has been retained, and "breath" put in the margin. The word has both senses; "spirit," though familiar to us in the sense of "apparition," occurs nowhere else in the O. T., and "breath" may be the true meaning. In v. 15 Eliphaz probably describes what he obscurely felt; in the next verse what he dimly saw; and in the verse following what he faintly heard.

The margin on "there was silence and I heard a voice," viz. "I heard a still voice," is well deserving of attention. And the same may be said of the margin to v. 17, "be just before God," where the text runs, "shall mortal man be more just than God?" The latter sense, though natural in syntax and favoured by some good authorities, has nothing in any other part of the book to support it. Job, though on one memorable occasion (chap. xvii. 8, *seq.*) he

expressed his determination to adhere to righteousness though God and man should both abandon it, and though he was charged by the Almighty with attributing injustice to Him that he himself might appear innocent (chap. xl. 8), never put forward the claim to be more righteous than God, and never was charged by his friends with making such a claim. The wrong he committed, and the wrong he was charged with committing, was that of attributing unrighteousness to God. And it is a great mistake to suppose that either Job or his friends showed any superfluity of naughtiness in their dispute, or drew invidious inferences, after the manner of modern controversialists, from each other's positions. There is no exaggeration anywhere in the substance of that for which they respectively contended, although Job perhaps admits a certain extravagance of manner, due to his desperate condition. In the present passage Eliphaz is animadverting on Job's murmurs against God, and, to bring back Job's mind to right thoughts of God and of himself, he extols the moral purity of God, which is such that no creature, not even the angels, are faultless in His sight, and much less such a gross and earthly being as man—or rather, perhaps, a being so frail. To Eliphaz no being could be pure before God; the idea of any creature being more pure than God was not only irrelevant to his purpose, but was an extravagance on which the speaker would not have wasted words.

In v. 20, "they are destroyed from morning to evening" of A.V. suggests rather the idea that they are continually, without intermission, destroyed. The meaning is, that men are destroyed in a single day, they are ephemerids. R.V. "betwixt morning and evening" is better, though *betwixt a morning and an evening* would be almost necessary. In v. 21, "doth not their excellency which is in them go away?" has been altered to "is not their tent-cord plucked up within them?" The striking of the tent is a graphic

and not uncommon image for the removal which comes in death; and, though the verse is rather obscure, R.V. probably suggests the true sense.

In chap. v. 1, the term "saints" becomes "holy ones," and so throughout. The angels are alluded to, while "saints" more naturally suggests men. In v. 2, for "*wrath* killeth the foolish man, and *envy* slayeth the silly one," R.V. uses the terms "vexation" and "jealousy." The latter word (Kin'ah) is difficult to render; jealousy is a common sense, though some such word as passion would be in place here. The meaning of course is not that the foolish and silly vex themselves to death, but that their rebelliousness or incorrect and passionate behaviour, under the just afflictions of heaven for their sins, brings down upon them additional chastisement, under which they perish. In v. 5, "robber" has been changed to "snare," in accordance with chap. xviii. 19.

A very slight though important alteration appears in v. 6, 7: "*although* affliction cometh not forth of the dust . . . *yet* man is born unto trouble," being changed into, "*for* affliction . . . *but* man," etc. The passage contains the general aphorism with which Eliphaz sums up his doctrine of human suffering and his explanation of its origin. Affliction is not an accident nor a spontaneous product of the world's soil, springing up like weeds without being sown; it is due to the evil heart of man, who is born of such a nature that he sins almost instinctively and as it were by a law—as the sparks fly upward—and thus brings trouble upon himself.

There may be some explanation unknown to us of the omission of the word "but" in A.V., v. 8, though it be expressed in the original, and the abrupt commencement, "I would seek unto God." R.V. "but as for me, I would seek," &c., "as for me" representing the pronoun, which is also expressed. The translation of the pronoun when

expressed is a delicate matter. It is often rendered in A.V. "as for me," "I, *even* I," and sometimes very falsely. Nothing could be worse than the rendering of the words of Deborah (Jud. v. 3), "I, *even* I, will sing unto the Lord." In languages which do not need the expressed pronoun along with the verb there is a much greater tendency to express the first personal pronoun than the others, though no emphasis upon it be designed. And in Heb. the pronoun is expressed when no special emphasis falls upon it, but in order to communicate a certain breadth and weight to the whole sentence, as for instance in the angel's reply to Gideon's request (Jud. vi. 18), "I will tarry until thou come again." Even when stress falls upon the pronoun, "as for me," or "I, even I," is unwieldy and unidiomatic; the force can only be rightly felt from the tone in which the simple "I" is uttered.—Finally, A.V. "shalt visit thy habitation and shalt not sin," receives meaning by being altered into "visit thy fold and shalt miss nothing" (v. 24).

The speeches of Job are generally more difficult than those of his friends, and consequently the alterations in them are in proportion more numerous. This applies, however, less to his first answer to Eliphaz (chap. vi.–vii.), than to those which follow. In all cases the sense of the individual points can be ascertained only from understanding the drift of the whole. In these two chapters there are three general divisions: Job's defence of his complaints, which Eliphaz had blamed (v. 1–13); his disappointment at the position which his friends had assumed towards him (v. 14–30); and his new sorrowful review of the brevity and pain of human life (chap. vii.). These three general ideas suggest more than once the right treatment of particulars.

In his justification of his complaints and despair several points have been made plainer in R.V. In v. 3, "therefore my words are swallowed up," could hardly mean anything

else than that the weight of Job's calamities had choked his utterance. But such a thought is quite irrelevant at the moment when he is defending his former language. And Job could hardly say that at any time he failed to get his breath out; for more than once he avows his determination to have his say against the Almighty's treatment of him, come what might (vii. 11; ix. 22; xiii. 13). R.V. "therefore have my words been rash" is much more to the purpose. It may remain doubtful, however, whether Job admits a certain moral error in his former words (rashness), or only concedes some extravagance and violence of language. It must be remembered that the injustice, which in chap. iii. he insinuates against heaven, he plainly charges in later speeches, and never retracts the charge—at least not until the appearance of the Lord in the storm (chap. xxxviii.). And the question he puts to his friends in regard to their cavils and the defence he offers, *v.* 26, "do ye imagine to reprove words? though the speeches of one that is desperate are as wind (or, go into the wind)," seems to imply that his admission affects only the form, not the substance, of his former complaint (although cf. *v.* 14).

In grammar at least an improvement has been effected in *v.* 10, in which A.V., "yea I would harden myself in sorrow: let him not spare," becomes "yea I would exult in pain that spareth not." The meaning of the word rendered "exult," is not very certain.—When it is remembered that in these verses Job is defending his impatience (*v.* 1), the pertinence of the change in *v.* 11 will be apparent, "what is mine end that I should be patient?" instead of A.V. "that I should prolong my life." In *v.* 13, A.V. gives a sense diametrically the opposite of that demanded by the connexion, "is not my help in me?" R.V. rightly, "is it not that I have no help in me?" Similarly the second clause must be put negatively, for Job's defence of his desire to die now (iii. 20; vi. 8) is his assurance that he must ultimately die of his

malady, for he is beyond recovery. The term rendered "wisdom" in A.V. appears here to mean something like physical resource, power of recovery, unless it might mean confidence in recovery. R.V. "effectual working" may appear to some readers not quite effectual.

In the verses where Job laments the defection of his friends there are several changes. In *v.* 14, he lays down the rule that kindness should be shown to the afflicted, or fainting, by his friend, and adds in A.V., "but he forsaketh the fear of the Almighty." The "he" can only refer to the "friend" of first clause; but such a charge against his comforters is quite out of place here. Their fault is inhumanity, not ungodliness (*v.* 27). R.V. renders, "even to him that forsaketh the fear," with marg. "else might he forsake," etc. In *v.* 18, "they go up into the waste," rightly supersedes "they go to nothing." In other respects a good deal may be said both for R.V., which makes the verse refer to caravans, and for A.V. (now in marg.), which makes it refer to the brooks. The remark of Ibn Ezra, that it was not the habit of caravans to "turn aside" from their route in search of water, is in favour of A.V. In *v.* 19, "the caravans" for "the troops" of Tema is a gain. "Caravan," like "canal," is one of the new semi-technical words of modern language which the Revisers have felt it necessary to introduce. They have scrupled at the less familiar "mirage" (rendering "glowing sand," Isa. xxxv. 7, and retaining "heat" Isa. xlix. 10), and given it a place only in the margin. Verse 27, "yea, ye overwhelm the fatherless, and ye dig *a pit* for your friend," gains decidedly both in point and accuracy in R.V., "yea, ye would cast lots upon the fatherless, and make merchandise of your friend"—the second clause after chap. xli. 6, "will the partners bargain over him" (leviathan)?

The course of thought in chap. vii. is clear, and, with one exception, no changes of great importance appear. The

minor changes are improvements, *e.g.* "warfare" for "appointed time," *v.* 1; "the night is long" for "and the night be gone," *v.* 4; particularly the graphic touch, *v.* 5, "my skin closeth up and breaketh out afresh," instead of the flatter "is broken and become loathsome"; and the substitution of "sea-monster" for "whale" *v.* 12. The whale is not a specially dangerous monster; and since Hamlet, allusion to him makes us laugh. Although the terms "sea" and "sea-monster" be without the article, this is common in poetry even when nouns are definite in sense, and perhaps "the sea," "the monster of the sea," would best suit Job's sarcastic demand, whether he be dangerous to the safety of the world, that he must be watched and plagued as he is by the Almighty? The monster of the sea is probably nothing more than the sea itself, mythologically conceived, when it rages and threatens to engulf the earth.

But of more than ordinary interest in various ways is the alteration in *v.* 20. A.V. reads: "I have sinned; what shall I do unto Thee, O Thou preserver of men?" This is naturally to be understood as a confession of sin, and perhaps an inquiry how if it were possible amends might be made for it unto God, who is devoutly addressed as "preserver" of men. R.V. gives an entirely different complexion to the passage: "If I have sinned, what do I (*marg.*, can I do) unto Thee, O Thou watcher of men?" Here Job does not confess sin; he makes the supposition that he has sinned, as a supposition merely, and asks how by that he could affect God? upon whom he throws a side-charge of severity and espionage, calling Him watcher of men (*chap.* xiv. 16, 17). This view of the passage, which is doubtless correct, is of interest, not only as marking the state of Job's mind at this stage of the drama, but as suggesting some peculiar directions which the Hebrew doctrine of sin and God might take. Several points deserve notice in the passage. One is the conception of the greatness of

God, who is so exalted that nothing done by man can affect Him, a common idea in the book. Another is the extreme littleness and insignificance of man in contrast with God, and also as belonging to his littleness, his imperfection and liability to err, though this point is less prominent here than for example in chap. xiv. And a third point is the tendency, due perhaps to the very strong theism of the Hebrew mind, to regard sin or wrong exclusively as a *personal* offence or injury to God, without any consideration of its nature in itself. This way of looking at sin in relation only to God personally, while it added emotion and often keenness to the sense of it, had in certain moods the contrary effect, evacuating it of its real meaning. If sin was merely an offence against God, who was so infinitely exalted, on the part of man so miserable and fallible, why was God so jealous in tracking it and so egoistic in exacting the penalty of it? This is the mood of Job's mind here; hence to his hypothesis that he may have sinned, he adds the question, Why dost Thou not pardon my transgression and take away mine iniquity?

In the speech of Bildad, chap. viii., there is no alteration of consequence. In v. 14, "whose hope shall be cut off," is changed into "shall break asunder," which agrees better with the comparison to a spider's house in the parallel clause. And in v. 18, the indeterminate construction, "if he destroy him," becomes clearer when put in the passive, "if he be destroyed." On the other hand in Job's reply, chap. ix., which is one of the most difficult chapters in the book, and in which Job reaches the lowest point of mental alienation from God, the changes are frequent.

In v. 3, A.V., "if he will contend with him," leaves in ambiguity who "he" and "him" is. R.V. decides that "He" is God and "him" man—"if He be pleased to contend;" but the other view occupies the marg., "if one should desire to contend," and is very well worthy of attention.

A more important change is found in *v.* 13, in which A.V., "if God will not withdraw His anger, the proud helpers do stoop under Him," becomes, "God will not withdraw His anger, the helpers of Rahab do (did) stoop under Him." Job is setting forth the impossibility of a man like himself contending with God in order to establish his own innocence, for who has opposed Him and been safe? (*v.* 4), and he refers to a memorable conflict which Rahab and his abettors vainly waged against Him. And his conclusion is, "How much less should I answer him?" Rahab is probably the raging sea, the sea-monster (*chap.* vii. 12); at all events the allusion is mythological. With similar advantage, "I would make supplication to my judge," has been altered into "to mine adversary" or opponent. Job fancies himself entering a judicial contest with God in regard to his innocence. Being a party in such a cause, God is not judge but adversary; yet such is the terror He would inspire that Job would desert his own just plea and make supplication to his opponent. With such an adversary law is a farce (*v.* 19).

The numerous margins to *v.* 19 indicate how difficult that verse is to render without a paraphrase. This is one of the passages where the use of marks of quotation would have been helpful to the reader; the words "lo" (here *I am*) and "who will appoint me a time" to plead? being expressions supposed to come from the mouth of God. The want of quotation marks has to be supplied by "saith he," as *marg.* 16.—"If *we speak* (if it be a question, or, matter) of strength of the mighty, Here *am I* (saith He), and if of judgment (law), Who will appoint me a time?" The general sense is evident. Whether the trial be one of power or of law man has no chance with God, who is ready for any kind of encounter, omnipotent in might and irresponsible in law.

The sense in which the next verses are to be taken will

appear from the change in *v.* 21, where “*though* I were perfect” has been altered into “I am perfect.” Of course this assertion of perfection is not an assertion of sinlessness, it is only a claim to that which God Himself had conceded to Job, that he was a perfect and upright man, fearing God and eschewing evil (*chap.* i. 8). Interpreted by this claim, however, the meaning of *v.* 20, “if I justify myself (R.V. if I be righteous), mine own mouth shall condemn me,” becomes plain. It means that in this encounter with God, though Job were righteous, as he is, he could not establish his righteousness; the terror of his adversary would so overpower him that his own mouth would betray him and stammer out, guilty. The verse is often read as meaning that for a man to justify himself is in fact to condemn himself out of his own mouth, that self-justification is *in articulo* self-condemnation. Such an idea, however, is foreign to the scope of this passage, in which Job makes the strongest claim to be righteous, and if his claim is ineffectual, it is not because it is not just, or because it is abashed before the holiness of God, but because it is overborne and paralysed by His might. Job’s position in claiming to be “righteous” may not be altogether, or at least at first sight, a Christian position, and the clearest proof of this perhaps is the difficulty which Christian interpreters have felt in accommodating themselves to the book, and the frequent strain they have put it under in order to make it speak the language of Christian piety. The interpreters of the book have, in some respects, occupied a higher religious platform than the book. At the same time, in justice to the book, the claim of Job should not be misunderstood. It must be remembered that it is less an absolute claim than a relative and antagonistic one. All that he contends for is really that he is a God-fearing man, and that his life has been consistent with his fear of God. There is such a thing as the fear of God, and there is a life

that corresponds to it. Men may enter into a life with God, and this life is continuous and of one consistency, embracing both the thought of the mind and practical conduct. He claims to have lived and to live such a life, his witness being his conscience; and what he resists with all his might is the insinuation of his friends, or the implication of God by his misfortunes (as he supposes), that he has been guilty of actions which to his mind would invalidate the possession of such a life. The view of life taken by his friends, on the other hand, is more atomistic or sectional, as we might say. According to them, a good man may act well for a time, then he may fall into gross sins and a sleep of sensuality, out of which the sharp rod of Divine chastisement may awaken him, when he will repent and do the first works, and all will be well. Now of course this theory is also true within certain limits and along the degrees of a certain scale; but it may be doubtful whether in thus cutting life into sections Job's friends do not drive their cleavage so deep down as to sever the continuous and permanent substratum of religious life which is the very presupposition of true religious life. On the other hand, Job was entitled to claim to be a God-fearing man against the denials of men; but when he made the claim against what he admitted was the denial of God, could he have had present in his mind the feeling that man could not attain to be God-fearing without the will and, to say the least, the co-operation of God?

Other changes in chap. ix. help to place the reader in the right point of view from which to look at Job's speech. In v. 22, A.V., "this is one thing, therefore I said it," etc., becomes, "it is all one, therefore I say, He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked," *i.e.* the perfect as the wicked. It is probable that "it is all one" means, I am indifferent whether I die or live; for Job anticipates that speaking out his mind on God's rule of men and the world will provoke

the Almighty to destroy him. Again, *v.* 24 gains in clearness and point by the change in the last clause: "He covereth the faces of the judges thereof (of the earth):" "if not, where and who is He?" R.V. "if it be not He, who then is it?" And only to notice one other point: *v.* 29, "*if* I be wicked, why then labour I in vain?" becomes in R.V. "I shall be condemned, why then do I labour in vain?" Job complains that all his efforts to show himself innocent are unavailing—he will be condemned, he has to be guilty, God is resolved so to consider him, why then should he expend useless efforts to demonstrate his innocence? a thought which he expresses in a graphic figure in next verse.

The changes in chap. x. are less numerous. In *v.* 1 the rather obscure phrase, "I will leave my complaint upon myself," becomes, "I will give free course to my complaint." In *v.* 13–16 some useful alterations occur. Job, baffled by the contrast between God's present affliction of him and His goodness to him in the past, is compelled to believe that His former goodness was but feigned, was indeed but a temporary expedient in order the better to carry out His purpose of plaguing him, as at present, which all the while was in His heart. In both versions the verses are translated from the point of view of the present, "if I sin, then thou markest me"; they would have gained in clearness if read from the point of view of God's past intention: "if I sinned, then thou wouldst mark," etc. In A.V. *v.* 16, "for it increaseth," is referred to Job's affliction; R.V. connects the words with an earlier part of *v.* 15, and renders, "and if *my head* exalt itself."

In the speech of Zophar, chap. xi. there are several margins which the reader should not miss. Verse 6 is difficult in the original, and A.V. "show thee the secrets of wisdom, that *they are* double to that which is," is somewhat enigmatic; R.V. "that it is manifold in effectual working";

marg., "sound wisdom is manifold." Verse 7, "canst thou by searching find out God?" is sometimes read as a question whether God be discoverable by the efforts of the natural mind. The marg., "canst thou find out the deep things of God?" suggests that the question is not whether God be discoverable at all, but whether He be wholly discoverable; not whether He can be found, but whether He can be comprehended. No Hebrew writer would have thought of putting the question whether God could be found or was knowable; the question, however, whether He could be wholly known, whether there were not deeps in His nature unfathomable by the mind of man, was a question which, with a view to right conduct under trying providences, many felt themselves compelled to put.

Verse 12 has long exercised the ingenuity of interpreters and come out under much variety of form. R.V. has adopted the suggestion of Gesenius, rendering, "vain man *is void of understanding*" (*yillabeb*), a sense which Delitzsch affirms to be improper in the tense and impossible in the conjugation. The marg. deserves attention: "an empty man will get understanding, when the wild ass's colt is born a man." Several slight changes in the succeeding verses are helpful, *e.g.* "life" for "age," *v.* 17; "thou shalt search about thee" for "thou shalt dig about thee," *v.* 18; and the omission of *as* in *v.* 20.

In Job's reply to Zophar, chap. xii.-xiv., there are some important alterations. A very small change in *v.* 4 adds greatly to its lucidity, "I am as one mocked of his neighbour," "who calleth upon God, and He answereth him"; R.V., "*a man that called,*" etc. Hebrew shows a curious disinclination to pursue constructions in the first or second person, diverging whenever it can into the third. Micah's "Hear ye peoples, *all of them,*" is strange to modern ears. In translating it is often necessary either to follow the practice of our own language, or to effect the transition to the

third person by using some indefinite term, as "a man," "one." Thus chap. xiii. 27, 28, "Thou drawest a line about the soles of my feet, though I am like a rotten thing," etc., R.V.; A.V. has, "and he, as a rotten thing, consumeth." The most natural rendering would be: "soles of my feet, one who," etc.

Verse 5 is wholly transformed, largely through a change not grammatical, but lexical, the term *lappid*, formerly considered a single word, *lamp*, being regarded as a compound, *pid* "misfortune," and the prep.; and several other changes, such as "priests" for "princes," v. 19, are at least gains in accuracy.

In xiii. 9 the change in tense and meaning is not without importance: "or as one deceiveth a man, will ye deceive Him?" for A.V., "or as one mocketh another, do ye so mock Him?" the time referred to by Job is when God shall appear to judge his friends for their false partiality in his favour. No doubt v. 12 refers to the same time, and might be put in the future tense: R.V., "your memorable sayings are proverbs of ashes, your defences are defences of clay;" certainly clearer than A.V., "your remembrances are like unto ashes, your bodies to bodies of clay."

The notable v. 15 has been left by R.V. very much in the condition in which it stood in A.V., with the alteration of "wait" for "trust," and "nevertheless" for "but." It may not be quite apparent at once what precisely R.V. means. It is known that the Vulgate, *etiamsi occiderit me, in ipso sperabo*, though a translation of the Heb. margin, passed into many modern versions, as into our own. Delitzsch in his commentary notices some affecting instances of the consolation afforded by the passage, as usually read, to pious persons when near death, although he himself feels constrained to reject the traditional sense. There are many mistranslated or misinterpreted passages in Scripture that have greatly supported pious thought

and feeling, such as "I am that I am," the present passage, "magnify the law and make it honourable," and others, because, though inaccurate renderings of the particular passages, they expressed forcibly great general truths of Scripture, or at least truths certainly scriptural. The history of such passages finds its parallel in very many of the expositions of Scripture which are heard from week to week. They are anything but accurate, well-balanced exegeses of the passages formally expounded, but they set forth in a rough and right way a meaning for which there is Scripture somewhere or other, and doubtless benefit many of those who hear them—although they give the unhappy few *di color che sanno* a bad quarter of an hour now and then, driving the wretched men sometimes to exclaim, that if they perish it is going to church that will be their undoing. What might be called truthful exegesis is one of the rarest things to meet. The reason is that the power of producing it is not a gift but an acquirement. Many sermons bear witness to the brilliancy, the thoughtfulness, or even to the laboriousness in certain directions of their authors, but comparatively few give any evidence of a patient study of Scripture in its connexion.

As regards the present passage, the margin is particularly deserving of attention. Both A.V. and R.V. are translations, not of the Heb. text, which reads "not" (lo'), but of the margin or K'ri, which is "for (in) him," or, "it" (lo)—following the ancient versions. The difference of reading is of little consequence. The margin of R.V. is: "*Behold, he will slay me; I wait for him*, or, according to another reading, *I will not wait*." The meaning of the verse as thus rendered is clear. Job anticipates that his boldness in going before God to defend his ways will provoke God to destroy him, and he says he waits for His destroying blow, nevertheless he will defend his own ways. If the reading "I will not wait" be accepted, then the meaning seems to be that Job

will not wait for a more distant death, but encounter the immediate one which his boldness makes too probable.

The important change in chap. xiv. 13-15 has already been alluded to.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXI.

THE PRACTICAL EFFECTS OF THE PEACE OF CHRIST, THE WORD OF CHRIST, AND THE NAME OF CHRIST.

“And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to the which also ye were called in one body; and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another with psalms *and* hymns *and* spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God. And whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him.”—COL. iii. 15-17 (Rev. Vers.).

THERE are here three precepts somewhat loosely connected, of which the first belongs properly to the series considered in our last paper, from which it is separated, only as not sharing in the metaphor under which the virtues contained in the former verses were set forth. In substance it is closely connected with them, though in form it is different, and in sweep is more comprehensive. The second refers mainly to Christian intercourse, especially to social worship; and the third covers the whole field of conduct, and fitly closes the series, which in it reaches the utmost possible generality, and from it drops to the inculcation of very special domestic duties. The three verses have each a dominant phrase round which we may group their teaching. These three are, the peace of Christ, the word of Christ, the name of the Lord Jesus.

I. The Ruling Peace of Christ.

The various reading “peace of Christ,” for “peace of

God," is not only recommended by manuscript authority, but has the advantage of bringing the expression into connexion with the great words of the Lord, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." A strange legacy to leave, and a strange moment at which to speak of His peace! It was but an hour or so since He had been "troubled in spirit," as He thought of the betrayer—and in an hour more He would be beneath the olives of Gethsemane; and yet, even at such a time, He bestows on his friends some share in His own deep repose of spirit. Surely "the peace of Christ" must mean what "My peace" meant, not only the peace which He gives, but the peace which lay, like a great calm on the sea, on His own deep heart; and surely we cannot restrict so solemn an expression to the meaning of mutual concord among brethren. That, no doubt, is included in it, but there is much more than that. Whatever made the strange calm which leaves such unmistakable traces in the picture of Christ drawn in the Gospels, may be ours. When He gave us His peace, He gave us some share in that meek submission of will to His Father's will, and in that stainless purity, which were its chief elements. The hearts and lives of men are made troubled, not by circumstances, but by themselves. Whoever can keep his own will in harmony with God's enters into rest, though many trials and sorrows may be his. Even if within and without are fightings, there may be a central "peace subsisting at the heart of endless agitation." We are our own disturbers. The eager swift motions of our own wills keep us restless. Forsake these, and quiet comes. Christ's peace was the result of the perfect harmony of all His nature—all was co-operant to one great purpose; desires and passions did not war with conscience and reason, nor did the flesh lust against the Spirit. Though that complete uniting of all our inner selves in the sweet concord of perfect obedience is not attained on earth, yet its

beginnings are given to us by Christ, and in Him we may be at peace with ourselves, and have one great ruling power binding all our conflicting desires in one, as the moon draws after her the heaped waters of the sea.

We are summoned to improve that gift—to “let the peace of Christ” have its way in our hearts. And the surest way to increase our possession of it is to decrease our separation from Him. The fulness of our possession of His gift of peace depends altogether on our proximity to the Giver. It evaporates in carrying. It “diminishes as the square of the distance” from the source. So the exhortation to let it rule in us will be best fulfilled by keeping thought and affection in close union with our Lord.

This peace is to “rule” in our hearts. The figure contained in the word here translated *rule* is that of the umpire or arbitrator at the games, who, looking down on the arena, watches that the combatants strive lawfully, and adjudges the prize. Possibly the force of the figure may have been washed out of the word by use, and the “rule” of our rendering may be all that it means. But there seems no reason against keeping the full force of the expression, which adds picturesqueness and point to the precept. The peace of Christ, then, is to sit enthroned as umpire in the heart; or, if we might give a mediæval instead of a classical shape to the figure, that fair sovereign, Peace, is to be Queen of the Tournament, and her “eyes rain influence and adjudge the prize.” When contending impulses and reasons distract and seem to pull us in opposite directions, let her settle which is to prevail. How can the peace of Christ do that for us? We may make a rude test of good and evil by their effects on our inward repose. Whatever mars our tranquillity, ruffling the surface so that Christ’s image is no longer visible, is to be avoided. That stillness of spirit is very sensitive and shrinks away at the presence of an evil thing. Let it be for us what the barometer is to

a sailor, and if it sinks, let us be sure a storm is at hand. If we find that a given course of action tends to break our peace, we may be certain that there is poison in the draught which, as in the old stories, has been detected by the shivered cup, and should not drink any more. There is nothing so precious that it is worth while to lose the peace of Christ for the sake of it. Whenever we find it in peril, we must retrace our steps.

Then follows appended a reason for cultivating the peace of Christ "to which also ye were called in one body." The very purpose of God's merciful summons and invitation to them in the Gospel was that they might share in this peace. There are many ways of putting God's design in His call by the Gospel—it may be represented under many angles and from many points of view, and is glorious from all and each. No one word can state all the fulness to which we are called by His wonderful love, but none can be tenderer and more blessed than this thought, that God's great voice has summoned us to a share in Christ's peace. Being so called, all who share in it of course find themselves knit to each other by possession of a common gift. What a contradiction then, to be summoned in order to so blessed a possession, and not to allow it sovereign sway in moulding heart and life! What a contradiction, further, to have been gathered into one body by the common possession of the peace of Christ, and yet not to allow it to bind all the members in its sweet fetters with cords of love! The sway of the "peace of Christ" in our hearts will ensure the perfect exercise of all the other graces of which we have been hearing, and therefore this precept fitly closes the series of exhortations to brotherly affections, and seals all with the thought of the "one body" of which all these "new men" are members.

The very abruptness of the introduction of the next precept gives it force, "and be ye thankful," or, as we might

translate with an accuracy which perhaps is not too minute, "become thankful," striving towards deeper gratitude than you have yet attained. Paul is ever apt to catch fire as often as his thought brings him in sight of God's great love in drawing men to Himself, and in giving them such rich gifts. It is quite a feature of his style to break into sudden bursts of praise as often as his path leads him to a summit from which he catches a glimpse of that great miracle of love. This interjected precept is precisely like these sudden jets of praise. It is as if he had broken off for a moment from the line of his thought, and had said to his hearers—Think of that wonderful love of your Father God. He has called you from the midst of your heathenism, He has called you from a world of tumult and a life of troubled unrest to possess the peace which brooded ever, like the mystic dove, over Christ's head; He has called you in one body, having knit in a grand unity us, Jews and Gentiles, so widely parted before. Let us pause and lift up our voices in praise to Him. True thankfulness will well up at all moments, and will underlie and blend with all duties. There are frequent injunctions to thankfulness in this letter, and we have it again enjoined in the closing words of the verses which we are now considering, so that we may defer any further remarks till a later part of this article.

II. The Indwelling Word of Christ.

The main reference of this verse seems to be to the worship of the Church—the highest expression of their oneness. There are three points enforced in its three clauses, of which the first is the indwelling in the hearts of the Colossian Christians of the "word of Christ," by which is meant, as I conceive, not simply "the presence of Christ in the heart, as an inward monitor,"¹ but the indwelling of the definite body of truths contained in the gospel which had been preached to them. That gospel is the word of Christ,

¹ Lightfoot

inasmuch as He is its subject. These early Christians received that body of truth by oral teaching. To us it comes in the history of Christ's life and death, and in the exposition of the significance and far-reaching depth and power of these, which are contained in the rest of the New Testament—a very definite body of teaching. How can it abide in the heart? or what is the dwelling of that word within us but the occupation of mind and heart and will with the truth concerning Jesus revealed to us in Scripture? This indwelling is in our own power, for it is precept and not promise—and if we want to have it we must do with religious truth just what we do with other truths that we want to keep in our minds—ponder them, use our faculties on them, be perpetually recurring to them, fix them in our memories, like nails fastened in a sure place, and that we may remember them, “get them by heart,” as the children say. Few things are more wanting to-day than this. The popular Christianity of the day is strong in philanthropic service, and some phases of it are full of “evangelistic” activity, but it is woefully lacking in intelligent grasp of the great principles involved and revealed in the Gospel. Some Christians have yielded to the popular prejudice against “dogma,” and have come to dislike and neglect the doctrinal side of religion, and others are so busy in good works of various kinds that they have no time nor inclination to reflect nor to learn, and for others “the cares of this world and the lusts of other things, entering in, choke the word.” A merely intellectual Christianity is a very poor thing, no doubt; but that has been dinned into our ears so long and loudly for a generation now, that there is much need for a clear preaching of the other side—namely, that a merely emotional Christianity is a still poorer, and that if feeling on the one hand and conduct on the other are to be worthy of men with heads on their shoulders and brains in their heads, both feeling and conduct must be

built on a foundation of truth believed and pondered. In the ordered monarchy of human nature, reason is meant to govern, but she is also meant to submit, and for her the law holds good, she must learn to obey that she may be able to rule. She must bow to the word of Christ, and then she will sway aright the kingdom of the soul. It becomes us to make conscience of seeking to get a firm and intelligent grasp of Christian truth as a whole, and not to be always living on milk meant for babes, nor to expect that teachers and preachers should only repeat for ever the things which we know already.

That word is to dwell in Christian men *richly*. It is their own fault if they possess it, as so many do, in scant measure. It might be a full tide. Why in so many is it a mere trickle, like an Australian river in the heat, a line of shallow ponds with no life or motion, scarcely connected by a thread of moisture, and surrounded by great stretches of blinding shingle, when it might be a broad water—"waters to swim in?" Why, but because they do not do with this word, what all students do with the studies which they love?

The word should manifest the rich abundance of its dwelling in men by opening out in their minds into "every kind of wisdom." Where the gospel dwells in its power in a man's spirit, and is intelligently meditated on and studied, it will effloresce into principles of thought and action applicable to all subjects, and touching the whole round horizon of human life. All, and more than all, the wisdom which these false teachers promised in their mysteries, is given to the babes and the simple ones who treasure the word of Christ in their hearts, and the least among them may say, "I have more understanding than all my teachers, for Thy testimonies are my meditation." That gospel which the child may receive, has "infinite riches in a narrow room," and, like some tiny black seed, for all its

humble form, has hidden in it the promise and potency of wondrous beauty of flower, and nourishment of fruit. Cultured and cared for in the heart where it is sown, it will unfold into all truth which a man can receive or God can give, concerning God and man, our nature, duties, hopes and destinies, the tasks of the moment, and the glories of eternity. He who has it and lets it dwell richly in his heart is wise; he who has it not, "at his latter end shall be a fool."

The second clause of this verse deals with the manifestations of the indwelling word in the worship of the Church. The individual possession of the word in one's own heart does not make us independent of brotherly help. Rather, it is the very foundation of the duty of sharing our riches with our fellows, and of increasing ours by contributions from their stores. And so—"teaching and admonishing one another" is the outcome of it. The universal possession of Christ's word involves the equally universal right and duty of mutual instruction.

We have already heard the Apostle declaring it to be his work to "admonish every man and to teach every man," and found that the former office pointed to practical ethical instruction, not without rebuke and warning, while the latter referred rather to doctrinal teaching. What he there claimed for himself, he here enjoins on the whole Christian community. We have here a glimpse of the perfectly simple, informal public services of the early Church, which seem to have partaken much more of the nature of a free conference than of any of the forms of worship at present in use in any Church. The evidence both of this passage and of the other Pauline Epistles, especially of the first Epistle to the Corinthians (xiv.) unmistakeably shows this. The forms of worship in the apostolic Church are not meant for models, and we do not prove a usage as intended to be permanent because

we prove it to be primitive ; but the principles which underlie the usages are valid always and everywhere, and one of these principles is the universal though not equal inspiration of Christian men, which results in their universal calling to teach and admonish. In what forms that principle shall be expressed, how safeguarded and controlled, is of secondary importance. Different stages of culture and a hundred other circumstances will modify these, and nobody but a pedant or religious martinet will care about uniformity. But I cannot but believe that the present practice of confining the public teaching of the Church to an official class has done harm. Why should one man be for ever speaking, and hundreds of people who are able to teach, sitting dumb to listen or pretend to listen to him? Surely there is a wasteful expenditure there. I hate revolution, and do not believe that any institutions, either political or ecclesiastical, which need violence to sweep them away, are ready to be removed ; but I believe that if the level of spiritual life were raised among us, new forms would naturally be evolved, in which there should be a more adequate recognition of the great principle on which the democracy of Christianity is founded, namely, "I will pour out My spirit on all flesh—and on My servants and on My handmaidens I will pour out in these days of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy." There are not wanting signs that many different classes of Christian worshippers have ceased to find edification in the present manner of teaching. The more cultured write books on "the decay of preaching;" the more earnest take to mission halls and a "freer service," and "lay preaching"; the more indifferent stay at home. When the tide rises, all the idle craft stranded on the mud are set in motion ; such a time is surely coming for the Church, when the aspiration that has waited millenniums for its fulfilment, and received but a partial accomplishment at Pentecost,

shall at last be a fact: "would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!"

The teaching and admonishing is here regarded as being effected by means of song. That strikes one as singular, and tempts to another punctuation of the verse, by which "In all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another" should make a separate clause, and "in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" should be attached to the following words. But probably the ordinary arrangement of clauses is best on the whole. The distinction between "psalms" and "hymns" appears to be that the former is a song with a musical accompaniment, and that the latter is vocal praise to God. No doubt the "psalms" meant were chiefly those of the Psalter, the Old Testament element in the early Christian worship, while the "hymns" were the new product of the spirit of devotion which had naturally broken into song, the first beginnings of the great treasure of Christian hymnody. "Spiritual songs" is a more general expression, including all varieties of Christian poesy, provided that they come from the Spirit moving in the heart. We know from many sources that song had a large part in the worship of the early Church. Indeed, whenever a great quickening of religious life comes, a great burst of Christian song comes with it. The onward march of the Church has ever been attended by music of praise; "as well the singers as the players on instruments" have been there. The mediæval Latin hymns cluster round the early pure days of the monastic orders; Luther's rough stormy hymns were as powerful as his treatises; the mystic tenderness and rapture of Charles Wesley's have become the possession of the whole Church—and so we hear from outside observers, that one of the practices of the early Christians which attracted heathen notice most was, that they assembled daily before it was

light, and "sang hymns of praise to one Christus as to a god."

These early hymns were of a dogmatic character. No doubt, just as in many a missionary Church, a hymn is found to be the best vehicle for conveying the truth, so it was in these early Churches, made up largely of slaves and women—both uneducated. "Singing the gospel" is a very old invention, though the name be new. The picture which we get here of the meetings of the early Christians is very remarkable. Evidently their gatherings were free and social, with the minimum of form, and that most elastic. If a man had any word of exhortation for the people, he might say on. "Every one of you hath a psalm, a doctrine." If a man had some fragment of an old psalm, or some strain that had come fresh from the Christian heart, he might sing it, and his brethren would listen. We do not have that sort of psalmody now. But what a long way we have travelled from it to a modern congregation, standing with hymn books that they scarcely look at, and "worshipping" in a hymn which half of them do not open their mouths to sing at all, and the other half do in a voice inaudible three pews off.

The best praise, however, is a heart song. So the Apostle adds "singing in your hearts unto God." And it is to be in "grace," that is to say, *in* it as the atmosphere and element in which the song moves, which is nearly equivalent to "by means of the Divine grace" which works in the heart, and impels to that perpetual music of silent praise. If we have the peace of Christ in our hearts, and the word of Christ dwelling in us richly in all wisdom, then an unspoken and perpetual music will dwell there too, "a noise like of a hidden brook" singing for ever its "quiet tune."

III. The all hallowing Name of Jesus.

From worship the Apostle passes to life, and crowns the entire series of injunctions with an all-comprehensive

precept, covering the whole ground of action. "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed"—then not merely worship, specially so called, but everything is to come under the influence of the same motive. That expresses emphatically the sanctity of common life, and extends the idea of worship to all deeds. "Whatsoever ye *do* in *word*"—then words are *doings*, and in many respects the most important of our doings. Some words, though they fade off the ear so quickly, outlast all contemporary deeds, and are more lasting than brass. Not only "the word of the Lord," but, in a very solemn sense, the word of man "endureth for ever."

Do all "in the name of the Lord Jesus." That means at least two things—in obedience to His authority, and in dependence on His help. These two are the twin talismans which change the whole character of our actions, and preserve us in doing them from every harm. That name hallows and ennobles all work. Nothing can be so small but this will make it great, nor so monotonous and tame but this will make it beautiful and fresh. The name now, as of old, casts out devils and stills storms. "For the name of the Lord Jesus" is the silken padding which makes our yokes easy. It brings the sudden strength which makes our burdens light. We may write it over all our actions. If there be any on which we dare not inscribe it, they are not for us.

Thus done in the name of Christ, all deeds will become thanksgiving, and so reach their highest consecration and their truest blessedness. "Giving thanks to God the Father through Him" is ever to accompany the work in the name of Jesus. The exhortation to thanksgiving, which is in a sense the Alpha and the Omega of the Christian life, is perpetually on the Apostle's lips, because thankfulness should be in perpetual operation in our hearts. It is so important because it presupposes all-important things, and because it

certainly leads to every Christian grace. For continual thankfulness there must be a continual direction of mind towards God and towards the great gifts of our salvation in Jesus Christ. There must be a continual going forth of our love and our desire to these, that is to say—thankfulness rests on the reception and the joyful appropriation of the mercies of God, brought to us by our Lord. And it underlies all acceptable service and all happy obedience. The servant who thinks of God as a harsh exactor is slothful; the servant who thinks of Him as the “giving God” rejoices in toil. He who brings his work in order to be paid for it, will get no wages, and turn out no work worth any. He who brings it because he feels that he has been paid plentiful wages beforehand, of which he will never earn the least mite, will present service well pleasing to the Master.

So we should keep thoughts of Jesus Christ, and of all we owe to Him, ever before us in our common work, in shop and mill and counting house, in study and street and home. We should try to bring all our actions more under their influence, and, moved by the mercies of God, should yield ourselves living thank-offerings to Him, who is the sin-offering for us. If, as every fresh duty arises, we hear Christ saying, “This do in remembrance of me,” all life will become a true communion with Him, and every common vessel shall be as a sacramental chalice, and on the bells of the horses shall be the same inscription as on the high priest’s mitre—“Holiness to the Lord.” To lay work on that altar sanctifies both the giver and the gift. Presented through Him, by whom all blessings come to man and all thanks go to God, and kindled by the flame of gratitude, our poor deeds, for all their grossness and earthliness, shall go up in curling wreaths of incense, an odour of a sweet smell acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

VI. THE SHEPHERD OF ISRAEL.—CHAP. XI.

EVERY reader of this book feels that in passing from the eighth to the ninth chapter he is making a distinctly marked transition to a new kind of writing. The first eight chapters are homogeneous. They have a resemblance to one another, and obviously form one whole ; but this continuity is broken by the remainder of the book. It is not only that the style changes, nor only that the interpreting angel who has figured so largely in the first part disappears from the second, in which his services are quite as much needed ; but the subject and character of the prophecies alter. In the first eight chapters the references to Zechariah's own time are continual, pointed, and obvious ; in the six remaining chapters there is not one allusion which obviously and without hesitation or dubiety can be referred to contemporary circumstances. In the former part of the book the prophet speaks of the half-built temple, of the gradually extending city, of the measurers, the masons, the stones, and the persons who were visible day by day in the streets of Jerusalem, and which he had only to name to call up the real object before the mind's eye. Every one of his allusions could at once be understood by the men who were then resident in Jerusalem ; and all his utterances regarded matters which every one was daily speaking about. But no sooner do we read the first verse of the ninth chapter than we experience a sudden loss of this firm foothold among the well-known events of Zechariah's time. We seem to have made a step off *terra firma* into quaking bog, where we can walk only flounderingly. Up to the ninth chapter we advance in the clearest sunshine. We see standing out in broad day every person or thing that the prophet has in view. But in chap. ix. we walk into a bank

of fog. We hear heavy firing, very heavy firing indeed, but we can only dimly and uncertainly make out the occasion and at whom the guns are directed.

This very marked difference between the first and second parts of this book has led many good men and good critics to conclude that these last chapters were anonymous, and were added to the Book of Zechariah for reasons now unknown—possibly because his book stood at the end of the “Prophets,” and fragments of unknown authorship were naturally appended to it. But the point which is of chief interest is the principle used to determine the date of this or any undated prediction. That principle is, that the prophet is always sent to relieve present anxieties and to guide the people through emergencies which have already arisen. Prophecy, however high and far it soars in its flight when once begun, has always its starting point from earth, from a spot within human eyesight and contemporary interest. As the miracles of our Lord had always a practical object in view as their primary end, and only secondarily served an evidential purpose, so had prophecy always in the first place a practical and immediate object to effect. If it can be shown that it deeply concerned one generation of Israel to be made aware of a coming event, and that the knowledge of this event did not at all concern any other generation, this of itself will afford strong presumption that the prophecy which predicts the event in question dates from the generation which behoved to know it.

And the reason why Zechariah’s generation is made aware of calamities which were about to fall on neighbouring peoples seems to be disclosed in ix. 8. God’s house was being rebuilt by that generation. The people were spending large sums of money upon it and for its sake were provoking the envy and hostility of their neighbours; and it could scarcely fail to occur to them that all this labour

might be in vain. They were a small and weak people and could not expect to cope with such empires as had previously laid their capital in ruins, or with that new Greek power which was already strangling serpents in its cradle. Nothing, then, could be more appropriate than to give to this generation those very assurances which fill the ninth chapter. It is a translation into the concrete and the actual of the word: "A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." The impregnable stronghold of Tyre shall be taken; the proud, unconquered, fierce Philistines will sink before a more unconquerable invader; how, then, shall the weaklings who quail before a few Samaritans stand before such an enemy? "I will encamp," says the Lord, "about Mine house, because of the army." The King of Israel would do battle for them, not with chariot and bow, but with meekness and peace. "I will raise up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and make thee as the sword of a mighty man."

But through this encouragement there breaks a warning. And the general purport of this warning cannot be mistaken. The Shepherd of Israel, seeing that all his care has been useless, breaks his crook and throws away the pieces, in token that he abandoned the hopeless task of tending so misguided a flock. It is not probable that the prophet actually presented himself on the streets of Jerusalem dressed as a shepherd, but only that in vision he saw himself doing the things which he here relates. Sometimes the prophets were required to dramatize what was revealed to them. Thus Ezekiel, in a striking counterpart to this vision of Zechariah's, was instructed to take two sticks, on one of which he was to write, "For Judah," and on the other, "For Joseph, the house of Ephraim and all the house of Israel his companions." And these two sticks were to be joined one to another into one stick in his hand.

And when the people asked him what this meant he was instructed to say : " Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in Mine hand. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes." It is the opposite picture which Zechariah is now called upon to exhibit to the people ; not a joining of two sticks to symbolize the union of Judah and Israel, but a breaking of a whole crook to symbolize the scattering of the flock. This might have been acted before the people, but the feeding of the flock could scarcely have been conveniently represented in the city.

The Shepherd-symbol of God was familiar to the Jews. In private they had used the words of their shepherd-king, " The Lord is my Shepherd." In public they had heard the Levites singing, " Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, Thou that leadest Joseph like a flock." The prophets had taken up the idea and elaborated it in such language as Isaiah's, " He shall feed His flock like a shepherd ; He shall gather the lambs with His arms, and carry them in His bosom." And as God's care of His people was discharged by kings, priests, and prophets, appointed by Him, these were regarded as subordinate shepherds ; and the Messiah, who was looked for as the fulfiller of all God's purpose of good to His people, was often thought of as the Good Shepherd—a title which, when He did come, He accepted as appropriate and illustrated in such a manner as to make it significant to His people in all generations. So that in Churches which indulge in symbolism, the bishop still carries the crosier or shepherd's crook, to indicate that he carries on the work of Him who is the Head Shepherd of our souls. In ancient times these subordinate shepherds often fell under the reproof of God for their negligence and self-seeking. " Woe to

the shepherds who do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flock? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool: ye kill them that are fed, but ye feed not the flock!" Too often in modern times also have the shepherds forgotten that they exist for the flock, and not the flock for them. Too often have they sought their own advantage, both individuals and Churches accumulating wealth and in many ways justifying the familiar satire of mediæval times: "There used to be golden bishops carrying wooden pastoral staves, but instead of them we have now wooden bishops carrying golden staves."

The symbolism of this prophecy would therefore present little difficulty to those for whom it was primarily meant. God's flock had fallen into evil hands; the natural protectors of the people were in fact their enemies, overtaxing them to maintain an extravagant royal splendour, and exacting from them priestly dues which bore no proportion to the work done. At various stages in the history of this vexed people the state of things here depicted actually emerged. In Herod's time they might fitly be called a flock of slaughter, kept for butchering purposes. God then makes one last attempt to save them. He sends a shepherd of His own selection to win the flock from the thralldom of their so-called shepherds, whose sole interest in the people arose from their expectation of making gain by them. This good shepherd goes out to his task with two staves—one, a short cudgel to beat off wild animals, the other a long crook to help his sheep out of holes and marshy ground. This "rod and staff" he calls by significant names, as knights used to call their swords by pet names. The one crook he calls *Graciousness*; the other, *Bands or Concord*—that is to say, he enters on his duties with the purpose of graciously defending the flock against assault from without and of keeping the sheep together as one flock. Room was made for this good shepherd by cutting off king,

priest, and prophet, three shepherds who had misled and abused the people.

But good as the shepherd was, the flock refused to be managed by him, so that he was compelled to give them up and ask his discharge. This they readily gave him, at the same time showing the value they set upon his services by offering him the thirty shekels which was the average price of a slave. Taking this price to the Temple, as the place where work done by God should be paid, he casts this paltry sum down with contempt, and breaks his staves as one who abandons as hopeless the task of feeding so worthless a flock. There is, however, always a remnant, the poor of the flock, the little ones, who appreciate God's care, and who are saved from the doom to which as a whole the flock is abandoned.¹

In this prediction there are various points of abiding interest. (1) The value set upon the good shepherd's offices and service. The prophet representing God in His capacity of Shepherd of Israel, was valued at thirty pieces of silver. This was Israel's way of saying, Any slave could do as good service. It was either a studied insult, or one of those insults which people commit through sheer stupidity and total misunderstanding of the persons and things with which they have to do. It is like offering a man sixpence for risking his life to save ours, whereby we show at once the value we attach to our own life and to his. The prophet was therefore instructed to cast this price to the potter. From the circumstance that no ground looks so waste and forsaken and is so worthless as a worked-out brick-field; or because the potters commonly worked in the valley of Hinnom, where all refuse was shot; or because broken dishes were conspicuous among the other refuse; or because at that time pottery was the cheapest of all manu-

¹ This is more distinctly brought out in the last three verses of chap. xiii. which seem somehow to have slipped out of their place.

factures; from one reason or other, the expression, "To the potter with it," had come to be equivalent to saying, "Throw away the worthless thing." Thus God pronounces upon the price paid by the Jews for all their shepherd's care—"a goodly price, forsooth!" a price you might give to a potter for a dish which is produced in thousands and which will soon find its way to the ash-pit with other broken ware. Is this the price at which men value the visitation of Heaven, the labour of God, the one exceptional thing which throws a halo round the world and a light upon its history? Is this the price at which they reckon their God and their own inheritance of fellowship with Him?

These thirty pieces of silver unexpectedly and curiously emerge in the last scenes of our Lord's connexion with the people on whom His shepherd-care was spent. This turned out to be the very sum with which the rulers bought the traitor. When they could stand the Shepherd's interference no longer, and sought to discharge Him, this was the sum they agreed upon as sufficient to accomplish their purpose. Nor was this the only coincidence. This paltry sum was cast into the house of the Lord. The traitor could not keep it; the coin seemed alive with accusations, it seemed to be turned into so many hissing and stinging serpents, and in the bitterness of his rage against those who had persuaded him to think this paltry sum was of more value than his Master, he hurled the ringing silver at them, as if disannulling the bargain and flinging the guilt back upon them. And still further, the sum was actually applied to purchase a worked-out potter's field, worthless for all other purposes, but which was given up for this merely nominal price, and was thought good enough to bury strangers in. Manifestly the priests did not notice these coincidences, or they would have avoided purchasing the plot of ground and so fulfilling the prophecy. But they

were led into this purchase by the fact of their having this blood-money in their hands, money which they could not appropriate to any holy, temple use; and when they heard that Judas had hanged himself in a deserted clay-hole, it struck them as the obvious thing to do, to purchase this place, which was now doubly worthless, having become a Field of Blood by his suicide, and bury him in it, thus putting him and his money at once out of sight. But though the priests did not at the time notice the coincidences, no one can be surprised that when next in the order of the synagogue service this passage from the prophets was read, many should be struck with these analogies, nor that Matthew should draw pointed attention to them.

The amount and importance of the coincidence between the words of the prophet and the facts of the betrayal, different men will differently estimate. It seems to me that there is evidence of a supernatural intelligence and control; but what it much more concerns us to observe is, that in two ages, five hundred years apart from one another, spiritual aid is held equally cheap and insolently rejected. It was not a savage heathen tribe that thus branded its own stupidity and coarseness of grain; neither was this rejection due to the rude, lawless, immoral section of society. In both instances the most efficient spiritual help that could be furnished was rejected by the best educated, most religious of the people; by those who should have guided opinion.

In various practical ways men show what value they set upon Christ's pastoral care. We may be shocked at a Judas who, by his act, declares that the best use he can put his Master to, is to turn Him into money: we may be shocked at the blindness of men who, having Christ on earth beside them, should be willing to pay to get rid of Him. We may be shocked at some of the more obvious forms in which these sins repeat themselves; we may scorn the man who will make no pecuniary sacrifice for his

religion ; who likes a Church where there is little to pay : we may be horrified when we detect that in any one instance we have shown ourselves to set a much higher value on money than upon our spiritual welfare—but, apart from the pecuniary way of estimating, there are many other ways in which we show the value we set on the pastoral care of Christ. If the sheep hear His voice and follow Him, that suffices Him ; for He is no hireling, but seeks only the good of the sheep. Has our readiness to follow His guidance and to submit ourselves to His rule amply proved to Him that we appreciate His care ? Does the difference between the intelligence of the sheep and the intelligence of the shepherd seem to us a fair representation of the difference between our ability to choose for ourselves and Christ's ability to choose for us ? Or might His crook as well be broken for all the use it has been in keeping us out of the mire and near to what is good.

Pastoral care of some kinds we do learn to appreciate. One of the most stainless characters of ancient times opens his immortal notes on life with an acknowledgment of the benefits he had received from the various persons he had known in boyhood. "From my grandfather I learned to be moral and to govern my temper. From the reputation and remembrance of my father I learned modesty and manliness of character. From my mother, piety and beneficence, and abstinence not only from evil deeds but even from evil thoughts ; and further, simplicity in my way of living ;" and so on through a long series of persons in each of whom he had seen something to imitate, and to each of whom he owed some part of what he was. How gratefully do we all look back to, or how painfully we miss, the care a parent spent upon us. How gratefully do we recall the significant word that was spoken to warn us from hidden dangers. How keenly now do we appreciate the watchful unobtrusive guidance that strove to make the

path of virtue pleasant to us ; that day by day took the measure of our temptations and of our moral strength ; that busied itself with our prospects and with a future that was far out of our own sight ; that had us in all its calculations, and was ever considering the bearing things would have upon us, and sternly turned us aside from the life which, in our ignorance of the world, we were choosing. Have we had any more valuable possession than the love that bore with our folly and shielded us from the results of our waywardness and vice, and sowed in us the seeds of all the good that can ever be in us ? Are such love and tendance to be bought in any hiring-market for thirty pieces of silver.

But when we consider this patient care, we recognise that much of it was inspired by Christ ; and we are also conscious that we have not yet outgrown the need of similar care. The time is far off when Christ may safely lay down His crook and leave us to ourselves. Things are so with us, that without the living and personal manifestation of God in Christ we should be almost entirely in the dark regarding God's nature and relation to us. The life that Christ now lives He lives for us, and guides and restrains His people by His unseen Spirit and visible providences. God has appointed that our spiritual life should come through Christ ; that He should be the centre of spiritual influence for the race. And we might as well try to sustain our physical life on carbonic acid gas instead of pure air, as attempt to live independently of Christ. It has therefore its absurd as well as its pathetic side, when men, individually or in communities, profess great concern about good government, beneficial institutions, individual morality, while they ignore Christ and despise His guidance. They are a mere flock of sheep in conclave wagging their foolish heads, while the shepherd, who sees over the hedge and knows what they guess at, stands neglected.

But [the thought which this subject inevitably stirs in

every Christian mind is, that it lies in our own power to compensate in some degree for past neglect, and to mitigate the indifference with which the labour of the Great Shepherd is regarded. Each of us can secure that He be welcomed and appreciated by at least one heart: that there be one heart in which His actions are rightly interpreted and by which it is clearly recognised that the work he has done is work which cannot be bought, and which nothing can accomplish for us but Divine self-sacrifice and patience. If the stroke of His crook be at times painful, it saves us from a pain that is greater. If again and again in life we find that to be forbidden which alone seems desirable, it is forbidden for reasons truly valid. Much that pains and wounds and grieves us is proof of the care, not of the carelessness of Him who guides and tends us. He feels for us in all our pain and will compensate for all our loss. He who laid down His life for the sheep will save them from all that threatens to make His sacrifice fruitless. And the imagination can picture no happier condition than that of the man who passes through all the darkness and troubles of this life with a constant and faithful docility, and suffers Christ to accomplish in him the whole design and desire of His infinite love.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

On Rev. i. 14.—In Rev. i. 14 we read, amidst the description of the Son of man seen by St. John, Ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡς¹ ἔριον λευκὸν ὡς χιών— words which may easily be translated with the A.V., though not exactly with the common punctuation, “His head and His hairs were white like¹

¹ The reading ὡσεὶ for one or the other ὡς will make no practical difference. But the introduction of that reading, if as is probable it is not original, shows

wool as white as snow." But this seems a very strange standard of comparison. We can understand either phrase, "white as wool" or "white as snow," but the combination of the two, by comparison first of the wool to the snow, and then of the hair to the wool so compared, seems very far-fetched.

And the only alternative punctuation leaves the sense, or at least the style, not much better. If we put a comma after instead of before λευκόν, we can translate, "His head and His hairs were white as *white* wool, as snow:" but that this is an awkward phrase is tacitly confessed by the Revisers of the A. V., while they adopted this view of the construction. They repeat the words, "as white" in the second clause, which then runs smoothly; but "white as white wool" is cumbersome if not redundant. If "wool" does not of itself suggest whiteness, what fitness has it for a standard to express the highest degree of whiteness? and when the plainly fit standard, "white as snow," is available, why should this be used, which so to speak needs elaborate preparation to fit it for a standard?

Now peculiar as the style and grammar of the Apocalypse are, it is certain that cumbersome and otiose phrases are not characteristic of it. It is also certain that St. John's double standard of whiteness is suggested by the description in the Book of Daniel of the Ancient of Days, "Whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head as the pure wool." In Daniel the double comparison is perfectly natural in thought and style: whence comes the confusion in St. John?

It seems worth asking, whether it may not be from a primitive corruption of the text. One late MS.—only one, so far as I know, that has yet been even partially collated—gives a reading for which the internal evidence seems as strong as can be when external attestation is at the very minimum—αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὥσεὶ ἔριον, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιών. Here, though Daniel is not textually quoted, the order of his clauses being changed, the sense is the same as with him, and the order is as clear and natural. The MS. containing this reading is that provisionally numbered 122 by Dr. Burgon in his list of MSS. prefixed to the last edition of Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.*—in the Chigi Library, R. v. 33. Though not older than the four-

that early scribes felt the awkwardness of the double ὡς. The frequency of the redoubling of the last syllable of λευκαὶ (λευκαὶ καὶ ὡς, κ.τ.λ.) has perhaps the same significance.

teenth century, it has an excellent text, reading *e.g.* in i. 6, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς; and in v. 10,¹ βασιλεύονσι. It is however rather carelessly written; and we cannot suspect the scribe himself of having made such a brilliant conjecture as this would be; he doubtless derived it, as other readings are derived, from a tradition of probably great antiquity.

I do not, however, venture to suppose that its antiquity was absolutely primordial. Even if the reading be right, it is likelier (in Dr. Hort's words)² to be "due only to a" [perhaps hardly] "casual and unconscious emendation of the erroneous current reading" than to have been "transmitted from the autograph, and preserved by some rare accident of mixture, notwithstanding the otherwise complete extinction of the line of transmission by which it had been conveyed." Nor, tempting as the reading is, is even the internal evidence unmixedly in its favour. The seven words are exactly the same as in St. Matt. xxviii. 3, which would explain their occurring "casually and unconsciously" to the mind of a scribe: and the "pure wool" of Daniel is possibly a reason for accepting as genuine the epithet here. But, true or not, the reading is at any rate interesting and worthy of record.

WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX.

Notes and News.—Prof. Cheyne of Oxford will publish in the autumn a new book on the Wisdom-literature of the Old Testament, entitled *Job and Solomon*. Unlike his *Prophecies of Isaiah*, this work does not profess in any degree a suspense of judgment on the critical problems of date and origin. Its leading principle, however, is one advocated in that earlier work, viz. the necessity of a thorough study of the exegesis of the Old Testament as a preliminary to a fruitful study of its criticism.

¹ In the limited time that I had available for work in the Chigi Library, I was able only to collate the first four chapters of the Revelation in this and Cod. 72. But I looked at the place cited, and a few farther on. I may take this opportunity of stating that Cod. Apoc. 68 in the Vatican Library contains c. i. 11–ii. 20; iii. 16–vi. 9; vii. 17–ix. 5—a good deal more than (I suppose) Scholz stated (I take as his the statement from Scrivener's *Introduction*). On the other hand, either the MS. does not contain xx. 1–xxi. 17, or I missed seeing it: the last passage, as far as I observed, begins καθαρὸν, ὅμοιον ὑαλῶ καθαρῶ.

² Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, Introduction, § 367, cf. § 360.

Attempts have not been wanting to popularize so-called results of criticism, without any but a superficial and biassed representation of the contents of the books criticised. Prof. Cheyne opens each section of his work with a sympathetic sketch of the contents, which he follows up with a survey of the present state of the criticism, of the book under consideration. It is thus an introduction to the criticism and exegesis of the Wisdom-literature that he offers both to the special student and to the intelligent Bible-reader. The books dealt with are Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Ecclesiasticus. The first and third of these are naturally dealt with on a larger scale than the others; indeed, Ecclesiasticus is primarily regarded as a kind of appendix to the Book of Proverbs. The question of the permanent religious value of these, until lately, rather neglected books is by no means left out of consideration. The publishers will be Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

. . . . Mr. G. J. Spurrell, of Balliol College, Oxford, has in preparation a volume of notes—chiefly philological—on the Hebrew text of Genesis. It will be adapted for the use of students at the university, and will supply a want that has long been felt of a suitable introduction to the philological study of the Old Testament. It will be published by the Clarendon Press, and may be expected early in the coming year.

. . . . The Bishop of Durham is engaged on a new edition of his work, *St. Clement of Rome*.

. . . . A new Hebrew-English Lexicon is in preparation by Prof. Brown of New York, with contributions from Prof. Briggs of New York, and Prof. Driver of Oxford. When ready it will be published at the Clarendon Press and simultaneously in America. This will be based avowedly on Mühlau-Volek's (9th) edition of Gesenius; but that is in many respects so unsatisfactory that it will be virtually a new work. At present English students are mainly dependent on Tregelles' edition of Gesenius.

. . . . New editions of the late Dr. Edward Robinson's Hebrew and Greek Lexicons are being prepared, under the supervision of pupils of his own.

. . . . Prof. Bredenkamp, the conservative scholar who succeeded Prof. Wellhausen in Greifswald, has been laid aside for a lengthened period by severe illness. This gave rise to a widespread report of his death which happily proves false. Dr. Breden-

kamp has returned to work, and has just issued the first part of his *Commentary on Isaiah*. He has been engaged on the study of Messianic Prophecy, and some of his more important results will be contributed by him to THE EXPOSITOR.

. . . . Prof. Brieger of Marburg has been appointed successor to Prof. Kahnis in Leipzig, and Prof. Harnack of Giessen takes his place at Marburg.

. . . . Prof. Harnack contributes a paper to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, on the recent works of Lightfoot, Hilgenfeld, and Völter on Ignatius and Polycarp. For his opinion of Lightfoot he refers to his articles in THE EXPOSITOR. He points out that Hilgenfeld, while now maintaining the interpolation theory of the Epistle of Polycarp, fails to support it by convincing reasons, and is evidently wavering under the influence of Lightfoot's arguments, which he is not able to confute. Complete unanimity on this subject seems not far distant. Völter maintains that the Epistle to the Romans is not genuine, and that six of the epistles are by an Ignatius of Antioch, who had nothing to do with the bishop of Trajan's reign, and was not himself a bishop. Harnack contemptuously rejects this solution of the problem, considers that Völter is not master of the literature of the period, and regards his arguments as hardly worth discussing. But he considers it significant that even Völter is impressed by the weight of the arguments for the genuineness of the epistles.

ST. PAUL FROM A JEWISH POINT OF VIEW.

It is a strange fact that the apostles chosen by Jesus of Nazareth to teach, in the first instance, the Jew, versed in the law, were, whatever their moral excellences may have been, on the whole, as regards Hebrew, untutored men. On the other hand, the Apostle of the Gentiles was one deeply versed in all the wisdom of the Jews, among whom he had only nominally to preach, whilst he was almost wholly untutored¹ in the learning of those whom he was to win to the new religion. But this is not the only strange fact in the rise of Christianity. The apparently foolish things conquered the apparently wise things of this world, time after time, in the progress of Gentile Judaism, if we may say so.

If Jesus of Nazareth—a place from which people never expected any good to come—*founded* Christianity, Saul of Tarsus—a place where heathenism was practised in its most corrupt form—certainly *spread* Christianity; Christianity which was to usher in that portion of Judaism destined to

¹ It is generally held that St. Paul was well acquainted with the language and literature both of Greece and Rome. For this assertion surely there is not sufficient warrant. His Greek is not better than that of any boy born in such a place as Tarsus, and his quotations from classic literature were not only current in every Greek or Roman, but even in every Jewish city. Menenius Agrippa's fable about the members and the stomach, Caius Mucius Scaevola's "*Romanus sum civis*," possibly, though not necessarily, quoted by St. Paul (Acts xxii. 28, etc.), Aratus' true description of our connection with God (though pantheistically used by its heathen author), were well known to every half-educated child in the Apostle's time. Has anybody ever dreamt of ascribing to R. Yehoshua ben Chananyah an acquaintance with classical literature on account of his quoting the fable of the lion (wolf) and the crane (see *Bereshith Rabbah*, cap. lxiv.)?

become the light of the Gentiles, redeeming them thereby from deadly sin, pouring out upon them the Spirit of Sanctification, and securing to them everlasting salvation.

If Saul, the first king of Israel, went out to seek for the asses of his earthly father, and obtained on that occasion the kingdom of Israel (1 Sam. ix. 3-20, x. 1-24), Saul of Tarsus went out to seek for the asses¹ of his Heavenly Father, and obtained thereby the kingdom of the Gentiles. The Lord, who in His *Justice* had swept away the wicked generation of the Flood, dispersed the rebels who built the Tower of Babel, destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and their criminal sister-cities by fire and brimstone; that same Lord in His *Mercy* devised a means and appointed an agent, not of crushing, destroying, and sweeping away those who were even more wicked, rebellious and criminal than the generations of the Flood, the Dispersion, and the Destruction of the five cities, but of sweeping away that wickedness itself. *That means was Christianity, and that agent was Saul of Tarsus!* If Jesus of Nazareth said of Himself that He was only sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, acknowledging thereby that there were in the flock of Israel many sheep that were not lost, many who stood in need of no physician because they were whole, Saul of Tarsus was sent to other sheep not of this fold, of whom there were so very few whole that the Pharisees had to compass sea and land to make one single proselyte every year, pleading thereby the cause of the Gentiles before God, symbolizing, as this single conversion did, the salvability of the heathen world, who were in a religious sense well-nigh dead.² The

¹ It must not be forgotten that the pre-Christian Gentiles, owing to their immoral state, were not better, and *less* innocent, than the asses, as both the prophet Ezekiel (xxiii. 20, concerning Egyptians) and the Babylonian Talmud (*Berakhoth*, leaf 58 a, concerning heathens in general) distinctly state. (Comp. Schiller-Szinessy, *Exposition, etc.*, p. 30, note 3, and p. 31, notes 1-4. For the same reason the Founder of Christianity (Matt. xv. 26, etc.) gives them the scarcely superior title of dogs.

² A certain lecturer's remark (in his paper, *Jewish Proselytes in Olden Times*,

Lord loves all nations, although His saints are in the hands of Israel (Deut. xxxiii. 3); and He destined Israel to be a light to the Gentiles, that thereby he (Israel) might become His salvation to the end of the earth (Isa. xlix. 6). All Israel, therefore—the generations that have passed away, iv.), that “the celebrated denunciation of Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 15) is scarcely warranted by any evidence now extant,” only shows that he (or rather his teacher in Rabbinic) has not read enough of the Midrashim in the original (for what he says in v. he has only at second hand). Had he done so, he would have found three passages, with slight variations, each fully bearing out the first part of the denunciation of Jews compassing sea and land to make one proselyte. Rab Chanin says: “There has been said concerning (the immorality of) the inhabitants of the sea-coast what had not been done (said) concerning the generation of the Flood (Zeph. ii. 5), ‘Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea-coast, the people of *Kerethim*, a people that deserve excision (*Kareth*); but by what merit do they continue to exist? By the merit of one heathen who becomes a God-fearing man (*i.e.* a proselyte) that they furnish every year.” (See *Bereshith Rabbah*, xxviii.; *Midrash* on Canticles i. 4; and *Yalqut* on Zeph. ii. 5.) (Compare Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 35.) Thus the fact of one proselyte being made every year by the scribes and Pharisees is verified. As regards the motives of those acting in this conversion, it must be remarked that there were excellent Pharisees and wicked Pharisees, and that out of the seven kinds of Pharisees which the Talmud (Yerushalmi, *Berakhoth*, ix. 5; Babli, *Sotah*, 22 b) enumerates, only two kinds were good, and of these only one was perfect: this one being a Pharisee, like Abraham, out of love to God. The second part of the denunciation of Jesus is borne out in the following way. A goodly number of things done by a non-Jew are not sins, but if done after becoming a Jew, are sins. For example, a non-Jew who works on the Sabbath, who does not fast on the Day of Atonement, etc., does not commit a sin. If he becomes a Jew and does not observe these Jewish laws, his sin is even greater than that of the Jew who neglects the same, seeing that whilst one born in the Jewish religion is only by reason of his birth bound to keep these laws, one voluntarily embracing the Jewish religion and disregarding its laws becomes thereby two-fold more a son of hell (T. B., *Yebamoth*, 47a; comp. Tur and Shulchan 'Arukh, *Yoreh De'ah*, Siman 268, § 2). It ought to be added, that whatever the opinion of Jews may be concerning the doctrines of the person of Christ, a religious Jew, *i.e.* a person whose religion does not consist in a mere negation of Christianity, cheerfully admits that Jesus of Nazareth was a man of the highest morality, and that he would not have uttered a word which he knew was not true. Moreover it is a well-known fact that by the side of sincere and truly religious Pharisees there were also found hypocrites, who used Pharisaism as a mere cloak, *tout comme chez nous aujourd'hui*. Has there ever been, or is there, a religious body in the midst of which this pest of hypocrites has not been, or is not to be found? Significant is the remark made by king Alexander Jannæus to his wife on his death-bed (Talmud Babli, *Sotah*, leaf 22 b): “Fear neither the Pharisees nor the non-Pharisees (*i.e.* the Sadducees), but fear the hypocrites (lit. “the dyed ones”) who look like Pharisees, whose deeds are those of Zimri and who demand the reward of Phineas” (Num. xxv. 6, 14, 15, *ibid.* 7, 11–13).

those now existing, and those yet to come—had, have, and ever will have, individually and collectively, the high duty of teaching the Gentiles. The Gentiles shall stand and feed the flocks of the Jews, shall be their ploughmen and their vinedressers, whilst the Jews shall be named the priests of the Lord, and shall be called the ministers of God (Isa. lxi. 5, 6). Waiting at the altar, they shall be partakers with the altar. The Jews shall have no riches of their own,¹ but shall live on the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory the Jews shall boast (*Ibidem*). Collectively Israel has hitherto not fulfilled this mission. Isolated individuals of this nation, however, certainly have. Christianity has carried a portion of the light of Judaism to the uttermost ends of the earth; Christianity itself, on the other hand, was carried by thirteen Hebrew men, representing the thirteen tribes of Israel.² The most Hebrew of these thirteen Hebrews, who laboured more abundantly than they all, though not he, but the grace of God that was with him (1 Cor. xv. 10), was Saul who also is called Paul³ (Acts xiii. 9).

¹ However honourably the rich Jews have acquired their riches, and however charitably they spend a large portion of them, both on their co-religionists and on non-Jews, it is, in the interest of the Jews themselves, most undesirable that they should excel their neighbours in wealth. These acquisitions not only arouse the envy of their fellow-citizens, but render such Jews themselves less inclined to fulfil their heaven-taught duties.

² Generally only twelve tribes are spoken of as constituting Israel; in reality, however, the tribe of Levi not only never ceased to be an integral part of the nation, but for nearly 150 years the priestly office was enhanced by princely and even royal dignity. Whatever may be the reason for the omission of Dan in Revelation (vii. 4-8), Levi is not omitted.

³ The absurdity of the opinion that Saul was called Paul from his noble Roman convert Sergius Paulus is too patent, and may be dismissed at once. Nor was he called Paul from the phrase used by him in reference to himself, "I am the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. xv. 9). He was no doubt called Saul and Paul simultaneously by his parents, in accordance with the Jewish fashion prevailing long before his time and to this day, of giving a Jewish child two names—one religious and one secular (see *Schiller-Szinessy Catalogue*, i. p. 160, note 1). Nor is "Paulus," signifying "little," a mere accident. It is a remarkable fact that Saul addressing Samuel (1 Sam. ix. 21) had long before used the following words: "Am not I a Benjamite of the *smallest* of the tribes of Israel, and (is not my family) *he least* of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin?"

The great Apostle of the Gentiles was apparently the younger of two children and the only son of his parents, who, like their parents before them, were strict Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6 R. V., and Lumby, *Camb. Bib. for Schools*). These had a threefold reason for calling their son after the first king of Israel. Although Roman citizens (*ibid.* xxii. 25, 27) they belonged to the tribe of Benjamin¹ (Rom. xi. 1; Philipp. iii. 5), to which the first king, who with all his shortcomings was declared by a voice from heaven to have been the chosen of the Lord (*Shaul Bechir Adonai*, Talmud Babli, *Berakhoth*, leaf 12 b), belonged, a circumstance which rendered this name popular in the tribe. They had a daughter (Acts xxiii. 16), but apart from the fact that the Jewish religion looks upon "Be fruitful and multiply" as a commandment, and not as a mere blessing (Mishnah, *Yebamoth*, vi. 6; comp. Tur and Shulchan 'Arukh, *Eben Ha'ezer*, Siman i. § 1), and that this commandment is not wholly fulfilled till a man has one son and one daughter at least (*ib.* 5); the Divine inheritance of male children was, among the Jews, from time immemorial, chiefly on account of their religious position, a source of greater gratification to the parents than the gift of daughters.² Father and mother, therefore, no doubt

¹ That the apostle Paul knew the tribe to which he belonged need surprise no one, as Judah and Benjamin had been separated from the ten tribes. A fact somewhat surprising is that R. Yochanan ben Napcha (of the 3rd century) knew that he was of the tribe of *Joseph* (T. B., *Berakhoth*, leaf 20 a).

² Here is a suitable occasion for removing a mistaken notion prevailing among the Gentiles concerning the position of women among the Jews. From a prayer recited by the males every day, "Blessed be Thou, Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast not made me a woman," the Gentiles arrive at the conclusion that in the eyes of the Jews a woman is looked upon as inferior. That woman is destined to be subordinate to man is admitted by the Old Testament (Gen. iii. 16) and by several passages in the New, as is well known. When a Jew says this blessing it is for two reasons: first, destined to be the mistress, woman has to look well to the ways of the household, and is therefore exempt from fulfilling all commandments depending on certain parts of the day which the male has to fulfil. Secondly, God has decreed and nature has destined woman to be subject to certain infirmities to which man is not subject, and in sorrow to bring forth children, from which man is exempt; therefore

prayed fervently for this Divine gift of a son, and when granted to them, gave him the appropriate name of *Shaul* ("the prayed-for one").¹ But there is evidently a proof that the parents of the Apostle, like the Levite parents of Samuel of old, devoted their son, as an act of gratitude, to the service of God (*Shaul*, "devoted").² Tarsus was a great commercial emporium, whilst Jerusalem was not; had they intended their son to be a merchant, they certainly would not have sent him from his native place to the Holy City. Tarsus was also a great philosophical school, whilst Jerusalem was not; had they meant their son to occupy himself with profane learning, they certainly would not have sent him from the capital of secular lore to the city of exclusive divinity. They, no doubt, had him taught the Bible at five years of age, the Mishnah at ten, and the Talmud at fifteen.³ We know from the Acts, that Saul spoke Hebrew (xxi. 40), and from Epistles, the genuineness of which has been rarely questioned,⁴ that he was well

his thanksgiving. Woman, on the other hand, gently submitting to God's wise ordinances, meekly pronounces the words: "Blessed be Thou, Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast made me according to Thy will." Practically the Jewish wife will be found to stand not only on terms of perfect equality, but even, in some cases, of superiority, and the tenderness and affection of a Jewish husband to his wife are proverbial. "If thy wife be little, bend down and whisper into her ear!" is the Talmudic maxim (Babli, *Baba Metzi'a*, leaf 59 a).

¹ 1 Samuel i. 20, the name of Shemuel, makes this definition to hinge upon the *u* being used as a preposition whilst the *l* stands for the Most Holy Tetragrammaton. Comp. Gen. xxix. 32, 33.

² 1 Sam. i. 28.

³ See Mishnah, *Aboth*, v. 20. This is no anachronism, as both Mishnah and Talmud, though not in a concrete form, were several hundreds of years anterior to the rise of Christianity. Hillel brought from Babylon Mishniyyoth; the Sopherim even earlier than he composed Mishniyyoth, of which traces are still left (see *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xvi. p. 504, note 5).

⁴ The arguments brought against Paul's authorship of the thirteen Epistles are so weak as to require no refutation; but the writer of this article is fully convinced from internal evidence that the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the original, belonged to St. Paul, and that only the Greek now in our hands is a somewhat inexact translation of it; *teste* vii. 2, 7, "*Daily as those high-priests,*" which is clearly contradicted by ix. 7 "*The high-priest alone once in the year.*" Now any one familiar with Aramaic knows that "*Daily*" is a mere mistake for the word "*Yommo*," which is the equivalent of "*The Day*," *i.e.* "the

acquainted with Rabbinic argumentation, and that he dexterously used the "Seven Rules" (*Tosephto*, vii. 11) which Hillel interpreted before the sons of Bethera. How could it be otherwise? He sat at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34) in whom was centred not merely the learning of his grand-sire, but that of all generations of Israel down to his day. On the other hand, his knowledge of languages and the profane sciences was very scanty indeed.¹

Saul of Tarsus was of a choleric and melancholy temperament, as is apparent from his writings. He was either near-sighted by nature, or his sight had been weakened by close study, perhaps both. If we may trust to old tradition, he was bald; his mouth, owing to his having early lost his teeth, was fallen in; and his beard was rough. His head was disproportionately large for his body and bent forward Moltke-like. He was altogether insignificant in appearance, of a weakly constitution and subject to epileptic fits. Add to this his trade [most Jews taught their sons a trade (*Mishnah*, *Qiddushin*, iv. 14)]—plaiting the unsavoury-smelling goats' hair into cloth for making tents, which was both unpleasant and unremunerative—and few fathers would have been anxious to have him for a son-in-law, and few maidens would have wished to have him for a husband.²

But all these disadvantages, which *prima facie* are against Saul of Tarsus ever having been married, would disappear, if it could be proved he was a member of the Synhedrion; as such it would have been necessary for him not only to have been married, but to have been the father of children (*Tosephto*, *Synhedrin*, vii. 5). But

Day of Atonement," when the high-priest alone entered the Holy of Holies. There are also many other evidences which (D.V.) we shall give in our Lectures on St. Paul's Epistles.

¹ See Note 1, p. 321.

² The common belief, that Jewish fathers were in the habit of disposing of their daughters without the consent of the latter, is a mistake, and ought to be corrected. "We will call the damsel and inquire at her mouth," has been a rule among Hebrews, Israelites and Jews, rarely violated, down to the present day (comp. T. B., *Qiddushin*, 41a, 81b).

Saul of Tarsus never was or could have been a member of the Synhedrion. However great his learning he lacked several of the qualifications necessary for a member of that body. No one could be placed among its members unless he was of a fine stature, versed in profane learning, having an imposing appearance, being of a certain age, possessing considerable riches (Kesaphim; according to another reading, understanding witchcraft, Keshaphim), having an acquaintance (though perhaps only a slight one) with seventy languages, and able by argument (though only sophistically) to prove animals, positively described as unclean in the Pentateuch, to be clean (T. B., *Synhedrin*, leaf 17a).¹ It is quite true that the custom, amounting to rule, of marrying at eighteen (Mishnah, *Aboth*, v. 20; and not at twenty as a would-be Talmudic scholar erroneously asserts) was almost a general one. A Jew who was without a wife was regarded as being without joy, without a blessing, without goodness, without the Law, without a wall, without peace (T. B., *Yebamoth*, 62b). A Jew that is without a wife is not a man (*ibid.* 63a). A Jew that is without a wife is as one that sheddeth blood. A Jew that is without a wife diminishes (the circulation of) God's image (*ibid.* 63b). A Jew that is without a wife deserves death (*ibid.* 64a). As soon as a man marries his sins cease (lit. are "stopped up, כִּתְּפֻקִּין," *ibid.* 63b). Saul of Tarsus was not the only one however who, even if he wholly

¹ All these rules were framed for good purposes. The imposing appearance, learning and venerable age were on the one hand to win the confidence of the persecuted innocent, and to exercise a restraining effect upon the wicked accuser and false witness. The possession of riches was to remove the temptation of taking bribes. The knowledge of witchcraft was to enable the judge to give an honest trial in cases of accusation of practising this black art. The knowledge of seventy languages (perhaps a thorough knowledge of one only on the part of each member) was to enable the Synhedrion to dispense with the services of interpreters from outside. The knowledge of sophistic dialectics was wanted to defeat sophistry by the same means; and, finally, a member of the Synhedrion had to be a father, inasmuch as that apparently would render him more sympathetic and merciful.

entertained the same views, nevertheless acted against his convictions for higher reasons. Others besides him, *e.g.* Shime'on ben 'Azzai, who divorced his betrothed (T. B., *Kethuboth*, leaf 63 *a* ; comp. *Tosaphoth*, catchword לברתיה, and T. B., *Sotah*, leaf 4 *b*) ; and Rab Saphro, who remained all his lifetime unmarried (T. B., *Pesachim*, 113 *a*), in spending their time in study, prayers and pious works, saw that they were fulfilling God's will in a higher sense than if they had married. But St. Paul had not even such a high idea of marriage. He no doubt called it honourable, but he called it more than once undesirable. He certainly was more tenderly attached to his true children in the faith than if they had been his own children in the flesh ; but even this fact shows that the spirit with St. Paul was everything and the body nothing.

How Saul of Tarsus, consenting to the protomartyr's death, and entrusted with a commission to persecute those "that were of that way" in Damascus, became Paul the apostle, need not be further touched on here. Is it not written in the Book of the Acts ? and is it not known to every reader thereof ? And the rest of his mighty works, how Gamaliel's disciple, so insignificant as regards his knowledge of Greek philosophy and Roman oratory, out-argued the proud and distinguished philosophers and orators of Greece and Rome, is it not written in the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles ? How the feeble, almost blind and epileptic little Jew dethroned the mighty gods of Olympus, is it not duly set forth in the history of the world in general, and in that of the Christian Church in particular ? And can this narrative be read by a Jew without deep emotion ? Next to the pride which a religious Jew naturally feels in being a child of the race and religion of Israel, he surely must feel proud of that man of his race and religion who had the power over nations and kingdoms, not merely to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to

throw down heathenism, but also to build and to plant Christianity—the Judaism of the Gentiles.

It will be easily understood from all that has gone before, that, in order fully to appreciate the great Apostle, his work and his writings, one must have some knowledge of Judaism and Rabbinic. This is nothing extraordinary; such knowledge is also needed for the proper understanding of the other books of the Greek Scriptures, from Matthew to Revelation. But it may perhaps surprise the readers of this article to learn that the writings of St. Paul are not merely of great interest to the Jews, but of the greatest importance for the understanding of certain laws and passages contained in the Talmuds and Midrashim, etc., the comprehension of which they deepen and the age of which they fix. We will give a few instances, some of which are of an Halakhic, some of an Agadic, one of a liturgic, and one of a Cabbalistic nature.

1. In the Talmud Yerushalmi, *Yebamoth*, ii. 6, the *Bereshith Rabbah*, vii., and elsewhere, a certain rabbi is blamed for having taught that it was lawful to circumcise the child of a Gentile woman on the Sabbath. The phrase which the disapproving R. Chaggai uses runs thus: "Surely we circumcise only on a Sabbath and the Day of Atonement the son of an Israelitish woman!" From the fact of St. Paul not circumcising Titus, whose mother was a Gentile, whilst he circumcised Timothy (who was the son of a Jewess, his father being a Greek) on account of the Jews, we learn that although it is said in Num. i. 18, "they declared their pedigrees after their families by the house of their *fathers*," the race and religion were only determined according to the *mothers*.¹

2. The law that a Jew ought not to bring a fellow-Jew into a Gentile court dates in Jewish literature, at the earliest

¹ It is true that this teaching had been already developed by R. Shime'on ben Yochai, who flourished in the second century (Yerushalmi, as above, and Babli, *Yebamoth*, 23 a).

from the end of the fifth or the commencement of the sixth century (see *Tanchuma*, *Pericope Mishpatim*; comp. also *Sheeltoth*, the same *Pericope*). Is this ordinance really of so late an origin? One feels from the nature of things that it must be by hundreds of years older, and from 1 Cor. vi. 1, 6, we have positive evidence that such is actually the case.

3. From T. B., *Mo'ed Quatan*, leaf 17a, we learn that we must not publicly rebuke learned men, etc. This tradition is given apparently as being of the second or third century, but it is mentioned already by St. Paul in 1 Tim. v. 1.

4. From T. B., *Megillah*, leaf 26a, the institution of the "seven good men" (deacons) of the town is spoken of in the fourth century.¹ That this institution, however, was at least three hundred years older is proved from Acts vi. 3.²

5. From the phrase, "widows that are widows indeed" (1 Tim. v. 3), we can see that the Rabbinic translation of Ezek. xlv. 22, "and a widow that shall have been a widow indeed," must have been known in the first century.

6. In *Bereshith Rabbah* (cap. xii.) a certain rabbi of the third century says that the ruin wrought by the curse pronounced on the first Adam will not be repaired till Messiah comes. But of course this idea could not have been of so late an origin. From Romans viii. 22 we see that it was well-known to St. Paul.

7. In T. B., *Youmo*, leaf 4a, and *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, i. it is said that Moses "נתקדש בענין." This may mean he was sanctified inwardly in, or that his body was spiritually

¹ It is to be noted that Josephus (*Antiqq.* IV. viii. 14), speaks of "seven men to judge in every city;" but this cannot refer to the institution of the deacons. The writer is there evidently speaking of the Smaller Court of Justice consisting of twenty-three men (seven judges, fourteen Levites, and two more persons to prevent the possibility of equal parties of three times seven, or twice eleven). For a somewhat similar account see *Synhedrin*, *Mishnah* (i. 6), *T. Y.* (i. 4), and *ibid.* *Babli* (17a). Nor can the *Mishnah* (*Sheqalim*, v. 2), by "Seven *Amar-kelin*," refer to the institution of deacons, as the preceding expression, "three *Gizbarin*," clearly shows.

² Although the Book of Acts was not written by St. Paul, the writer of it was certainly inspired by him, as is well known.

purified by, the cloud, etc. From 1 Cor. x. 2, we see that נתקדש בענן must mean "washed by the cloud." Compare *Kiddush yadayim veraglayim* (Mishnah, *Youmo*, iii. 2), which means purification of hands and feet.

8. In T. B., *Synhedrin*, leaves 90b-91b, in which the Resurrection is treated of, there is among other things a proof given from the grain of wheat. Josephus (*Hades*, 5) also uses this simile. But it is more largely and fully treated of in 1 Cor. xv. 37, etc.

9. That the trumpet will be blown on the Day of the Ingathering of Israel is known from the O. T. (Isa. xxvii. 13; Zech. ix. 14); that the trumpet will be blown at the Resurrection of the Dead is taken for granted by the Jews. The earliest source of this is generally given as Saadia Gaon; but this statement is not correct, for it is already mentioned, not only by the somewhat unreliable Josephus (*Hades* 5), but also by the most reliable Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 52.

10. From Philippians iv. 18 we see that the Rabbinic view, given in T. B., *Youmo*, leaf 71a, directing any one that wants to pour out wine upon the altar to refresh the learned, was actually known at the time when temple and altar yet stood.

11. The liturgical phrase, "*Emeth Veyatzib*," etc., is spoken of in the Mishnah, *Tamid* (second century), as having been recited in the temple. It is impossible that the present prolix form could have been recited in the temple; but from the phrase continually used by St. Paul, "faithful saying" (1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Titus iii. 8) which is evidently taken from the "*Emeth Veyatzib*" in the morning prayers, we can see that originally the phrase must have run "*Emeth veyatzib* VENEEMAN HADDABAR," with the omission of all the matter between, etc.

12. The *Shi'ur Qomah* was certainly known to Saadia Gaon; the Cabbalists hold the book to be of the first

century, and the ideas contained therein to be pre-Christian. These dates are of course ridiculed by anti-Cabbalists as being at least eight hundred years too early. But what will the latter say when they read Eph. iv. 13, where this very phrase, "Measure of the stature," already occurs?

In conclusion, we must mention one point in connexion with St. Paul's conversion. It is the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Whilst most Christians think it a duty to convert the Jews as a whole, and naturally believe in the sincerity of individual Jewish converts, Jews generally not only deny the general proposition, but call into question the sincerity of such individuals. No doubt some of these converts are sincere, whilst others are not. We can quite understand the idiosyncrasies of isolated Jews, who leave the religion in which they were born and embrace Christianity. There are so many points of contact between the two religions, the parent and the child; so many points of attraction in Christianity, so many points of advantage, both worldly and spiritual, that the pure doctrine of Judaism is easily obscured. Christianity indeed has, as regards the Gentiles, a firm footing in the Hebrew Scriptures themselves (Joel iv. [iii.] 18; Zech. xiv. 8, etc.), as mediate help for the development of the world towards Judaism: by the Bible it spreads, by the Messianic idea it promulgates, by the morality it teaches, and by the idea of right and justice as exhibited in the Mosaic Law for which it paves a way. The truth is, according to the Hebrew Scriptures and the history of the world down to our day, the people of Israel must dwell alone and not be reckoned among the nations (Num. xxiii. 9). Christianity for the Gentiles, Judaism for the Jews. As to the sincerity of the individual Jew who becomes a Christian, the Apostle unconsciously and, of course, unintentionally furnishes us with a perfect and unerring standard of opinion—a standard which the writer of these lines has applied at least a hundred times, finding it

in the end absolutely correct. The worst enemies of St. Paul have charged him with becoming a Christian, and teaching Christianity, on account of madness brought about by much study (Acts xxvi. 24) ; but no one has ever charged or indeed could charge him with insincerity. Now what do we find? St. Paul was a zealous Jew before he became a zealous Christian ; a bad Jew will rarely become a good Christian. Moreover St. Paul, in his great anxiety to convert his “ kinsmen according to the flesh,” whom he loved more than himself on account of their being “ Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers,” he, to whom to be with Christ was gain, said that he wished to be accursed of Christ, *i.e.* that he was actually ready to sacrifice his own salvation if he could thereby secure salvation to them. If a converted Jew is sincere, can he stand on the other side in the day that strangers rob Israel of his moral forces? can he, with St. Paul’s example before him, speak evil of his kinsmen in the flesh? and still less can he assist in violence against his brother Jacob? (Shame shall cover him for ever!) Now the writer of this article could actually furnish examples of insincere converts, living in England at the present time, which fully bear out this remark. But though—or let it be said, because—a Jew by birth, education, and conviction, he forbears from doing so ; and rather glories in the still more excellent way so graphically described by the Apostle (1 Cor. xiii. 1-8), “ If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge ; and if I have all faith, so as to move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me

nothing. Love suffereth long and is kind: love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness but rejoiceth with the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth." In a word (Prov. x. 12): "All sins are covered by—*love*!"

S. M. SCHILLER-SZINESSY.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

VII. NATIONAL REVIVAL.—CHAPS. XII. XIII.

THE prophecies of this book close with predictions of the political importance and military glory of the Jewish people. This future greatness is somehow to be connected with or even to spring out of a poignant national repentance. The cause of this repentance is obscure, but apparently the nation is to be by some means awakened to its undutifulness and disloyalty to its Divine King. The people are to look upon Him whom they have pierced, and to mourn.

Stress is laid upon the circumstance that the repentance will be national and universal: "The land shall mourn every family apart." Once or twice in each generation there occur calamities, such as the Indian mutiny or the Crimean war, when the mourning is not merely national but domestic, not merely domestic but national. As when the firstborn of Egypt was slain, the death-wail rises from every household. The calamity is general, yet each feels as if it were peculiar to himself.

Natural as it is to look for the fulfilment of this prediction in the days succeeding the crucifixion of Christ, it cannot be said that in those days there was anything which could be called a national repentance. The awe which

fell upon those who saw the Messiah die and who retired smiting their breasts probably soon passed away. On the part of the rulers there might for a few days be an uneasy shamefacedness. There might be vague fears during the silence of the night entering the minds of the thoughtful. There might be more animated discussions of the claims of Jesus, or a careful avoidance of the subject. But certainly even the revolution of feeling produced by the preaching of Peter was circumscribed and far from being national.

Individuals have in all ages accepted their share of guilt in the crucifixion of Christ. Penitents have never shrunk from owning that but for their guilt Christ had not died. But this is far from fulfilling the prediction of a simultaneous, national, Jewish mourning, such as is here spoken of. Only the one nation which crucified the Messiah is capable of such a repentance. No other nation has this particular guilt of rejecting and crucifying their long-expected king, for whom they existed as a nation and apart from whom they seem to have no *raison d'être*. They only can exhibit a national repentance for this crime; they only can nationally reverse the verdict they passed upon their King.

And I believe that nothing would more rapidly accomplish the happy results depicted in these chapters, or more speedily win the world to Christ, than were the Jews to complete their marvellous history by once again combining, and this time to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ. The remorse would be terrible, a bitterness as of one "mourning for his only son;" so terrible that no one can wonder that the Jews cannot think of it as a possible thing that they should have crucified their Messiah. And yet what event could be so exemplary to the world? Who could be such efficient missionaries as the countrymen of Paul, who are already found in every country and speaking every important language? The Jews themselves have never ceased to look forward to some national resuscitation. They have

fallen away from some of their old beliefs and usages and hopes, but there seems ever to spring up again among them the expectation that they shall yet have a land and a king of their own. A Christian cannot fail to think that there is a finer consummation of their great history, and a future more profitable to the human race.

Here then we have a prediction of a national revival first manifesting itself and striking its fruitful root in a profound sorrow for past dereliction of duty, and developing into a craving for cleansing from all defilement and for severance from all that has characterized the sinful past. These are signs which accompany all revivals of religious life which spring from God's will and the outpouring of His Spirit.

There is, first, a looking upon Him whom we have pierced and a being in bitterness on His account. The applicability of this passage to the contrition awakened by the cross of Christ will not be questioned even by any who may believe that the prophecy has no positive reference to our Saviour. Certainly the most effective knowledge of sin and the most fruitful contrition are produced by a consideration of the significance of Christ's death. The bitterness of mourning produced by the cross has a healing virtue in it. Bitterness of a similar kind every one has felt. We know what it is to bewail the results of our sin when we see these results in the grief and shame and suffering of our friends. We have done a selfish action, aiming at our own happiness without sufficient consideration of others, and now we see that owing to this action of ours, some innocent persons whom we love are compelled to pass a life of lessened happiness and to bear a burden all their days. This brings us daily compunction and sorrow. The parent sees that in his child which day by day speaks to him of his own heedlessness and folly and transgression, and the difficulties with which the innocent child has to contend bring the bitterest of reflections to the heart of the parent.

Or the son, on the other hand, who at length recognises how ill he has requited a parent's love and has embittered and darkened the life he should have gladdened, when he looks on the unreproachful, loving face of him or her whom his ruthlessness has pierced, feels a bitter compunction and a keener distress than any disaster could inflict.

“What spectre can the charnel send
So dreadful as an injured friend?”

If, as time rolls on, we come to see how much trouble and suffering our sins have brought into the lives of others, if we are compelled to recognise how frequently and sorely our sins which we thought concerned no one but ourselves have smitten others, we know the bitterness that accompanies the looking upon those whom we have pierced. Nothing brings a man lower in his own eyes; nothing so directly persuades him that sin is a real evil. To have blighted our own life is bitter, but to see others suffering in consequence of our wrong-doing is the extreme of humbling pain.

But the analogy used by the prophet is of a slightly different kind. He compares the sorrow out of which springs this national repentance, to the national mourning at the death of the good king Josiah, when the whole nation bewailed him, driven in as he was to Jerusalem sorely hit by the archers, and his life's blood dripping from his chariot. Now, when we read the account of Josiah's death we find this circumstance brought out in the narrative, namely, that he perished in a cause with which he was not compelled to mix himself up, but which his kingly spirit prompted him to make his own. When Necho, king of Egypt, came with his troops to Carchemish, he sent ambassadors to Josiah, saying, “What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah? I come not against thee this day but against the house wherewith I have war: for God commanded me to make haste; forbear thee from meddling with God, who is with

me, that He destroy thee not." But Josiah's sense of honour prevented him from listening to this warning; he went to battle and was pierced to his death. And as the people saw him brought home, his armour stained with blood, their mourning was tenfold more bitter, because they knew it was not in any private quarrel of his own he had fallen, but had died as their king, sacrificed to his position and his own sense of what was due to his position as prince of Judah. Each one of them felt that noble as his life had been, his death had been nobler still; and that, true king, servant and representative of his people as he had ever shown himself in his life, he had never better borne his people's burden than when he entered that fatal battle which the weaknesses and sins of former generations and of his own people had made necessary. And they mourned him now as one whom they had pierced—not that their loyal hands would ever have inflicted those wounds which the Egyptian arrows had torn in his flesh, but because they were conscious that it was for them and in their cause he had fallen, and because they bitterly understood now how heavy and fatal a burden was the crown of a nation like theirs. They felt that they were chargeable with his death, inasmuch as it was their quarrel he had espoused and in their cause he had died. His blood had been spilt in discharging their political duties and in redeeming their political mistakes. And the citizen who had that day gone apart to carry on business of his own, and whose own private and present prosperity prevented him from shedding a tear over the fallen king, would have been justly denounced as a heartless traitor with no right to any inheritance in Judah. The man who had not public spirit enough to feel that in a most true sense his king had died for him, for his home and liberty—the man who could not understand what the people meant by crying in the streets "we have pierced our king"—that man might well have been denounced as incredibly selfish, unpardonably bound

up in his own narrow prosperity, the very worst kind of citizen.

And it is only the profound and dull-eyed selfishness that naturally possesses us which can prevent us from joining in the acknowledgment that we have pierced our King, and from feeling the bitterest compunction on this account. Only because He made our cause His own did our Lord suffer and die. Only because He undertook all our liabilities and accomplished what He saw the world chiefly needed did He suffer as He did. And to disclaim any connexion with His death is to renounce our claim to be within His kingdom, and to depart on a private path of our own which can only bring us to increasing isolation and uselessness.

A second feature of the national revival here predicted was that there should be "a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness," so that the contamination and defilement of which any and all were conscious, might be removed. The self-loathing produced by a sense of sin's pollution, prevents men from expecting any great future. And conscience seems to pronounce that for this self-loathing there is no remedy. The murderess looks at the stained hands in despair, and cries—

"Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand? No: this my hand will rather
The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
Making the green one red."

And all men are dismayed to find how deeply the pollution of former sins cuts into the character and the life, and dims the lustre of all we are concerned in. Years of varied experience may stand between our old transgressions and our present state, but the defilement, like an unstanched wound, strikes through all that overlays it. More needful than even forgiveness is cleansing. No man can be happy while filled with self-loathing: nothing tends to make men so content

with their old level as the sense of self-defilement. Were we conscious of spotless garments, we should strive to keep them clean ; but spotted as they already are, what boots it to avoid specks that will add nothing to the stains already existing? Thus we cease to connect ourselves with any true spiritual glory in the future, and become resigned to a condition on which the trail of sin is everywhere seen.

Provision therefore is made for ridding men of this sense of defilement, which lies deeper than the fear of punishment and cuts the sinew of all effort. It is removed, so far as it can be removed, when the desire and hope of a new and pure character are sincerely cherished ; when we cease to sympathize with our old self, and are no longer partakers in our own old sins ; when the connexion is cut between our old life and that which we now live. And this germ of a new life is sown in us when we believingly listen to the call of Christ. "Now ye are clean," said our Lord to His disciples, "through the word which I have spoken unto you." They were conscious of perfect integrity in receiving the call of Christ. They had no repentances, no regrets for having chosen Him. They wished to be His and His only. In this new sense of devotedness to Christ their old sense of defilement was abolished. It is attachment to Christ, and belief in the power of this attachment to root evil out of the heart, that makes us new men. And in proportion as we are hearty and sincere in our devotion to Him are we conscious of integrity and purity, of inward cleanness.

A third feature which should characterize this great national revival is indicated in the words (xiii. 2), "I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land." And so thorough was to be the revulsion from the state of feeling which could encourage false prophets, that even the parents of any one who presumed to prophesy would thrust him through. In many countries, more or less civilized, there are at the present day large numbers of

men who gain their livelihood by exercising those functions which are here denounced ; divining, soothsaying, casting out evil spirits, and so forth. And the existence of such false prophets implies the existence of a large amount of unbelief, superstition, and ignorance. Instead of endeavouring to detect the real criminal by the ordinary cross-examination of witnesses, and other ways of sifting evidence, one of these diviners is invited to point out the culprit, so that justice is upset. Instead of endeavouring to discover the real cause of disease, and so prevent its recurrence, a diviner is asked to perform certain magical rites by the bedside of the patient, so that all medical science is nipped in the bud. And worst of all, these false prophets are looked to as able to explain God's will and pry into the secrets of heaven, so that all application of the individual soul to God is discouraged and prevented. In Judah many had gained a living by fortune-telling, by offering to get messages from the dead for the guidance of the living, and by professing to have special revelations from God about matters of state. This was to poison the stream of knowledge at its source. The very men who should have guided the people became their perverters, and led them astray. And one of the most welcome symptoms of a new state of matters would therefore be the entire cessation of such false teaching. If a lad showed a leaning towards divination and soothsaying, his very parents would put him to death. And so alive would the whole people become to the evil and wickedness of such courses, that no man would dare to assume the peculiar dress of the prophets or to be in any way recognised as a prophet. It was only when indelible marks were found upon his body, which proved that he had been convicted of divination and punished for it, that any one would be brought to confess that such was his profession.

It will be observed that to apply the words of the sixth verse to our Lord, because there is a mention of wounds

in the hands, is out of the question. It is indeed almost blasphemous to refer to Him words which were originally levelled against the very worst class of *false* prophet. And that the words have sometimes been so applied, is only another illustration of the ignorant and irreverent recklessness with which phrases from the Old Testament are dislocated from their context and are perverted to utterly alien uses.

Every revival of religion in the individual or the community must go hand in hand with zeal for the truth, with the renunciation of superstition and ignorance. These false prophets both in Judah and in other lands have been driven out before the advance of truth of every kind, scientific as well as religious. All truth belongs to God and tends to His glory. Science is His as much as religion. "The world is His and the fulness thereof," and whatever can be found in that world will help on His cause. You deaden the power of idolatry and false religion now by sending to the heathen scientific medical men and teachers, as well as by sending evangelists. Delivering them from the thralldom of error and superstition, you bring them so much nearer to truth and to God. And we ourselves also have doubtless much to learn from science, which will give us wider and deeper views of God and of all truth. And it is the man who is most at one with His Lord who will most fearlessly welcome every fresh light that dawns upon His mind, knowing that all light tends to reveal Him who is Himself in all and through all.

The superstition that prevails in our own religious views and practices, as well as the superstition that prevails in Romanism, will be dispelled by that light which comes together with religious warmth. Our hope lies in the continuance of resolute serious-minded enquiry into religious matters. Serious men will in the long run be drawn where there is freest access to the truth. If we imitate the

Church of Rome, and say that the Church has the truth and that the individual has no right to enquire but only to learn, our day is done. Our day is done when among us men see what they saw in Rome :

“ Strength by limping sway disabled,
And art made tongue-tied by authority,
And folly (doctor-like) controlling skill,
And simple truth miscalled simplicity.”

The great danger in our day in connexion with the Church of Rome is that men fling themselves into her arms to be protected from the terrifying images of doubt that crowd our atmosphere. Some of the ablest, most devout and godly, most saintly and Christ-like, most influential and sincere of our contemporaries have left their Protestant position and have joined the Church of Rome. And the moving cause in the case of some of them is, that being of an irrepressibly enquiring mind, and having at once a most earnest *desire* to believe and a subtle disposition that suggests all manner of difficulties and doubts, they have felt that the exercise of private judgment was a heavier burden than they could carry. They have foreseen that enquiry in their case would be endless, that they could never satisfy their own subtle intellects ; they have feared they might become sceptics ; and shrinking from this as the most painful issue, they have put an end to their hesitation by renouncing private judgment and submitting themselves to the living voice of God in the Church. The process of mind that results in such action is illogical, inconsistent, self-stultifying ; but it is frequently rather a process of feeling than a process of thought which guides men to the Church of Rome. And the process of feeling is something like this : I wish to be a child of God, I wish to be religious, I need a Father for my spirit ; but I cannot satisfy myself about Christianity ; there are difficulties I cannot solve ; I must therefore conceive of religion as

a matter regarding which I am to follow my instincts rather than my logical faculty, and I therefore give up the attempt to satisfy my intellect in this sphere and yield myself to that great Church which has most prominently and in all ages represented Christianity.

Wherever then you find that rare combination of a profoundly religious nature with a subtle sceptical mind, there you will also find that the Church of Rome has attractions. Practically that Church retains her hold by providing a religion that has nothing to do with the intellect or with external evidences. The Church presents itself as the great evidence of religion, as the present manifestation of Christ.

And however hard a battle Rome may have to fight with reason and science in the coming years, Protestantism will have no less difficulty in adopting and adjusting to the fundamentals of her creed, all that science brings to light, and all the new and larger ideas that the progress of events will discover. We cannot, like Romanism, declare science our foe. Protestantism and science are allies and blood relations, and if we are to maintain our religious life at all, it must be in the full blaze of modern discovery and intellectual light, and not among the moles and bats, in the holes where the relics of superstition have had their haunt.

MARCUS DODS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXII.

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.

"Wives, be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.

"Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children, that they be not discouraged.

"Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord: whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance: ye serve the Lord Christ. For he that doeth wrong shall receive again for the wrong that he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.

"Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."—COL. iii. 18-iv. 1 (Rev. Ver.).

THIS section deals with the Christian family, as made up of husband and wife, children, and servants. In the family, Christianity has most signally displayed its power of refining, ennobling, and sanctifying earthly relationships. Indeed, one may say that domestic life, as seen in thousands of Christian homes, is purely a Christian creation, and would have been a new revelation to the heathenism of Colossæ, as it is to-day in many a mission field.

We do not know what may have led Paul to dwell with special emphasis on the domestic duties, in this letter, and in the contemporaneous Epistle of the Ephesians. He does so, and the parallel section there should be carefully compared throughout with this paragraph. The former is considerably more expanded, and may have been written after the verses before us; but, however that may be, the verbal coincidences and the variations in the two sections are very interesting as illustrations of the way in which a mind fully charged with a theme will freely repeat itself, and use the same words yet in different combinations and with infinite shades of modification.

The precepts given are extremely simple and obvious.

Domestic happiness and family Christianity are made up of very homely elements. One duty is prescribed for the one member of each of the three family groups, and varying forms of another for the other. The wife, the child, the servant are bid to obey; the husband to love, the father to show his love in gentle considerateness; the master to yield his servants their dues. Like some perfume distilled from common flowers that grow on every bank, the domestic piety which makes home a house of God, and a gate of heaven, is prepared from these two simples—obedience and love. These are all.

We have here then the ideal Christian household in the three ordinary relationships which make up the family; wife and husband, children and father, servant and master.

I. The Reciprocal Duties of wife and husband—subjection and love.

The duty of the wife is “subjection,” and it is enforced on the ground that it is “fitting in the Lord”—that is, “it is,” or perhaps “it became” at the time of conversion, “the conduct corresponding to or befitting the condition of being in the Lord.” In more modern language—the Christian ideal of the wife’s duty has for its very centre—subjection.

Some of us will smile at that; some of us will think it an old-fashioned notion, a survival of a more barbarous theory of marriage than this century recognises. But, before we decide upon the correctness of the apostolic precept, let us make quite sure of its meaning. Now, if we turn to the corresponding passage in Ephesians, we find that marriage is regarded from a high and sacred point of view, as being an earthly shadow and faint adumbration of the union between Christ and the Church.

To Paul, all human and earthly relationships were moulded after the patterns of things in the heavens, and the whole fleeting visible life of man was a parable of the

“things which are” in the spiritual realm. Most chiefly, the holy and mysterious union of man and woman in marriage is fashioned in the likeness of the only union which is closer and more mysterious than itself, namely that between Christ and His Church.

What then is the nature, what is the spring of the Church’s “subjection” to Christ? Such is the wife’s to the husband. That is to say, it is a subjection of which love is the very soul and animating principle. In a true marriage, as in the loving obedience of a believing soul to Christ, the wife submits, not because she has found a master, but because her heart has found its rest. Everything harsh or degrading melts away from the requirement when thus looked at. It is a joy to serve where the heart is engaged, and that is eminently true of the feminine nature. For its full satisfaction, a woman’s heart needs to look up where it loves. She has certainly the fullest wedded life who can “reverence” her husband. For its full satisfaction, a woman’s heart needs to serve where it loves. That is the same as saying that a woman’s love is, in the general, nobler, purer, more unselfish than a man’s, and therein, quite as much as in physical constitution, is laid the foundation of that Divine ideal of marriage, which places the wife’s delight and dignity in sweet loving subjection.

Of course the subjection has its limitations. “We must obey God rather than man” bounds the field of all human authority and control. Then there are cases in which, on the principle of “the tools to the hands that can use them,” the rule falls naturally to the wife as the stronger character. Popular sarcasm, however, shows that such instances are felt to be contrary to the true ideal, and such a wife lacks something of repose for her heart.

No doubt, too, since Paul wrote, and very largely by Christian influences, women have been educated and ele-

vated, so as to make mere subjection impossible now, if ever it were so. Woman's quick instinct as to persons, her finer wisdom, her purer discernment as to moral questions, make it in a thousand cases the wisest thing a man can do to listen to the "subtle flow of silver-paced counsel" which his wife gives him. All such considerations are fully consistent with this apostolic teaching, and it remains true that the wife who does not reverence and lovingly obey is to be pitied if she cannot, and to be condemned if she will not.

And what of the husband's duty? He is to love, and because he loves, not to be harsh or bitter, in word, look or act. The parallel in Ephesians adds the solemn elevating thought, that a man's love to the woman, whom he has made his own, is to be like Christ's to the Church. Patient and generous, utterly self-forgetting and self-sacrificing, demanding nothing, grudging nothing, giving all, not shrinking from the extreme of suffering and pain and death itself—that he may bless and help—such was the Lord's love to His bride, such is to be a Christian husband's love to his wife. That solemn example, which lifts the whole emotion high above mere passion or selfish affection, carries a great lesson too as to the connexion between man's love and woman's "subjection." The former is to evoke the latter, just as in the heavenly pattern, Christ's love melts and moves human wills to glad obedience which is liberty. We do not say that a wife is utterly absolved from obedience where a husband fails in self-forgetting love, though certainly it does not lie in *his* mouth to accuse her, whose fault is graver than and the origin of hers. But, without going so far as that, we may recognise the true order to be that the husband's love, self-sacrificing and all-bestowing, is meant to evoke the wife's love, delighting in service, and proud to crown him her king.

Where there is such love, there will be no question of

mere command and obedience, no tenacious adherence to rights, or jealous defence of independence. Law will be transformed into choice. To obey will be joy; to serve, the natural expression of the heart. Love uttering a wish speaks music to love listening; and love obeying the wish is free and a queen. Such sacred beauty may light up wedded life, if it catches a gleam from the fountain of all light, and shines by reflection from the love that binds Christ to His Church as the links of the golden beams bind the sun to the planet. Husbands and wives are to see to it that this supreme consecration purifies and raises their love. Young men and maidens are to remember that the nobleness and heart-repose of their whole life may be made or marred by marriage, and to take heed where they fix their affections. If there be not unity in the deepest thing of all, love to Christ, the sacredness and completeness will fade away from any love. But if a man and woman love and marry "in the Lord," He will be "in the midst," walking between them, a third who will make them one, and that threefold cord will not be quickly broken.

II. The Reciprocal Duties of children and parents—obedience and gentle loving authority.

The injunction to children is laconic, decisive, universal. "Obey your parents in all things." Of course, there is one limitation to that. If God's command looks one way, and a parent's the opposite, disobedience is duty—but such extreme case is probably the only one which Christian ethics admit. The Spartan brevity of the command is enforced by one consideration, "for this is well-pleasing *in the Lord*," as the Revised Version rightly reads, instead of "to the Lord, as in the Authorized, thus making an exact parallel to the former "fitting in the Lord." Not only to Christ, but to all who can appreciate the beauty of goodness, is filial obedience beautiful. The parallel in Ephesians substitutes "for this is right," appealing to the

natural conscience. Right and fair, in itself it is accordant with the law stamped on the very relationship, and witnessed as such by the instinctive approbation which it evokes.

No doubt, the moral sentiment of Paul's age stretched parental authority to an extreme, and we need not hesitate to admit that the Christian idea of a father's power and a child's obedience has been much softened by Christianity; but the softening has come from the greater prominence given to love, rather than from the limitation given to obedience.

Our present domestic life seems to me to stand sorely in need of Paul's injunction. One cannot but see that there is great laxity in this matter in many Christian households, in reaction perhaps from the too great severity of past times. Many causes lead to this unwholesome relaxation of parental authority. In our great cities, especially among the commercial classes, children are generally better educated than their fathers and mothers, they know less of early struggles, and one often sees a sense of inferiority making a parent hesitate to command, as well as a misplaced tenderness making him hesitate to forbid. A very misplaced and cruel tenderness it is to say "would you like?"; when he ought to say "I wish." It is unkind to lay on young shoulders "the weight of too much liberty," and to introduce young hearts too soon to the sad responsibility of choosing between good and evil. It were better and more loving by far to put off that day, and to let the children feel that in the safe nest of home, their feeble and ignorant goodness is sheltered behind a strong barrier of command, and their lives simplified by having the one duty of obedience. To many parents the advice is needed—consult your children less, command them more.

And as for children, here is the one thing which God

would have them do: "Obey your parents in all things." As fathers used to say when I was a boy—"not only obedience, but prompt obedience." It is right. That should be enough. But children may also remember that it is "pleasing"—fair and good to see, and making them agreeable in the eyes of all whose approbation is worth having, and pleasing to themselves, saving them from many a bitter thought in after days, when the grave has closed over father and mother. One remembers the story of how Dr. Johnson, when a man, stood in the market place at Lichfield, bareheaded, with the rain pouring on him, in remorseful remembrance of boyish disobedience to his dead father. There is nothing bitterer than the too late tears for wrongs done to those who are gone beyond the reach of our penitence. "Children, obey your parents in all things," that you may be spared the stings of conscience for childish faults, which may be set tingling and smarting again even in old age.

The law for parents is addressed to "fathers," partly because a mother's tenderness needs the warning "provoke not your children," less than a father's more rigorous rule usually does, and partly because the father is regarded as the head of the household. It is full of practical sagacity. How do parents provoke their children? By unreasonable commands, by perpetual restrictions, by capricious jerks at the bridle, alternating with as capricious dropping the reins altogether, by not governing their own tempers, by shrill or stern tones where quiet, soft ones would do, by frequent checks and rebukes, and sparing praise. And what is sure to follow such mistreatment by father or mother? First, as the parallel passage in Ephesians has it, "wrath"—bursts of temper, for which probably the child is punished and the parent is guilty—and then spiritless listlessness and apathy. "I cannot please him whatever I do," leads to a rankling sense of injustice, and then to recklessness—

“it is useless to try any more.” And when a child or a man loses heart, there will be no more obedience. Paul’s theory of the training of children is closely connected with his central doctrine that love is the life of service, and faith the parent of righteousness. To him hope and gladness and confident love underlie all obedience. When a child loves and trusts, he will obey. When he fears and has to think of his father as capricious, exacting or stern, he will do like the man in the parable, who was afraid because he thought of his master as austere, reaping where he did not sow, and went and hid his talent. Children’s obedience must be fed on love and praise. Fear paralyses activity, and kills service, whether it cowers in the heart of a boy to his father, or of a man to his Father in heaven.

So parents are to let the sunshine of their smile ripen their children’s love to fruit of obedience, and remember that frost in spring scatters the blossoms on the grass. Many a parent, especially many a father, drives his child into evil by keeping him at a distance. He should make his boy a companion and playmate, teach him to think of his father as his confidant, try to keep his child nearer to himself than to anybody beside, and then his authority will be absolute, his opinions an oracle, and his lightest wish a law. Is not the kingdom of Jesus Christ based on His becoming a brother and one of ourselves, and is it not wielded in gentleness and enforced by love? Is it not the most absolute of rules? and should not the parental authority be like it—having a reed for a sceptre, lowliness and gentleness being stronger to rule and to sway than the “rods of iron which earthly monarchs wield”?

There is added to this precept, in Ephesians, an injunction on the positive side of parental duty: “Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” I fear that is a duty fallen wofully into disuse in many Christian households. Many parents think it wise to send their children away

from home for their education, and so hand over their moral and religious training to teachers. That may be right, but it makes the fulfilment of this precept all but impossible. Others, who have their children beside them, are too busy all the week, and too fond of "rest" on Sunday. Many send their children to a Sunday school chiefly that they themselves may have a quiet house and a sound sleep in the afternoon. Every Christian minister, if he keeps his eyes open, must see that there is no religious instruction worth calling by the name in a very large number of professedly Christian households; and he is bound to press very earnestly on his hearers the question, whether the Christian fathers and mothers among them do their duty in this matter. Many of them, I fear, have never opened their lips to their children on religious subjects. Is it not a grief and a shame that men and women with some religion in them, and loving their little ones dearly, should be tongue-tied before them on the most important of all things? What can come of it but what does come of it so often that it saddens one to see how frequently it occurs—that the children drift away from a faith which their parents did not care enough about to teach them? A silent father must make prodigal sons, and many a grey head has been brought down with sorrow to the grave, and many a mother's heart broken, because he and she neglected their plain duty, which can be handed over to no schools or masters—the duty of religious instruction. "These words which I command thee, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house."

III. The Reciprocal Duties of servants and masters—obedience and justice,

The first thing to observe here is, that these "servants" are slaves, not persons who have voluntarily given their work for wages. The relation of Christianity to slavery is

too wide a subject to be touched here. It must be enough to point out that Paul recognises that "sum of all villanies," gives instructions to both parties in it, never says one word in condemnation of it. More remarkable still, the messenger who carried this letter to Colossæ carried in the same bag the Epistle to Philemon, and was accompanied by the fugitive slave Onesimus, on whose neck Paul bound again the chain, so to speak, with his own hands. And yet the gospel which Paul preached has in it principles which cut up slavery by the roots, as we read in this very letter, "in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free." Why then did not Christ and his apostles make war against slavery? For the same reason for which they did not make war against *any* political or social institutions. "First make the tree good and his fruit good." The only way to reform institutions is to elevate and quicken the general conscience, and then the evil will be outgrown, left behind, or thrown aside. Mould men and the men will mould institutions. So Christianity did not set itself to fell this upas tree, which would have been a long and dangerous task; but girdled it, as we may say, stripped the bark off it, and left it to die—and it *has* died in all Christian lands now.

But the principles laid down here are quite as applicable to our form of domestic and other service as to the slaves and masters of Colossæ.

Note then the extent of the servant's obedience—"in all things." Here, of course, as in former cases, the limit is presupposed of supreme obedience to God's commands; that being safe, all else is to give way to the duty of submission—a stern command, that seems all on the side of the masters, and that might strike a chill into many a slave, who had been drawn to the gospel by the hope of finding some little lightening of the yoke that pressed so heavily on his poor galled neck, and of hearing some voice speaking in tenderer tones than those of harsh command.

Still more emphatically, and, as it might seem, still more harshly, the Apostle goes on to insist on the inward completeness of the obedience—"not with eyeservice" (a word of Paul's own coining) as "men-pleasers." We have a proverb about the worth of the master's eye, which bears witness that the same faults still cling to hired service. One has only to look at the next set of bricklayers one sees on a scaffold, or of haymakers one comes across in a field, to see it. The vice was venial in slaves; it is inexcusable, because it darkens into theft, in paid servants—and it spreads far and wide. All scamped work, all productions of man's hand or brain which are got up to look better than they are, all fussy parade of diligence when under inspection and slackness afterwards—and all their like which infect and infest every trade and profession, are transfixed by the sharp point of this precept.

"But in singleness of heart," that is, with undivided motive, which is the antithesis and the cure for "eyeservice"—and "fearing God," which is opposed to "pleasing men." Then follows the positive injunction, covering the whole ground of action and lifting the constrained obedience to the earthly master up into the sacred and serene loftiness of religious duty, "whatsoever ye do, work heartily," or from the soul, where the word for *work* is stronger than that for *do*, and implies effort and toil. They are to put all their power into their work, and not be afraid of hard toil. And they are not only to bend their backs to it, but they are to give their good will, and toil, "from the soul," that is, cheerfully and with interest, to their master's will—a hard lesson for a slave, and asking more than could be expected from human nature, as many of them would, no doubt, think. He goes on to transfigure the squalor and misery of the slave's lot by a sudden beam of light—"as to the Lord"—your true "master," for it is the same word—"and not unto men." Do not think of your tasks as only enjoined by

harsh, capricious, selfish men, but lift your hearts to Christ, who is your Lord, and glorify all these sordid duties by seeing His wonderful will in them. He only who works as "to the Lord," will work "heartily." The thought of Christ's command, and of my poor toil as done for His sake, will change constraint into cheerfulness, and make unwelcome tasks pleasant, and monotonous ones fresh, and trivial ones great. It will evoke new powers, and renewed consecration. Plunged into that atmosphere, the dim flame of servile obedience will burn more brightly, as a lamp plunged into a jar of pure oxygen.

The stimulus of a great hope for the ill-used, unpaid slave, is added. Whatever their earthly masters might fail to give them, the true Master whom they really served would accept no work for which He did not give more than sufficient wages. "From the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance." Blows and scanty food and poor lodging may be all that they get from their owners for all their sweat and toil, but if they are Christ's slaves, they will be treated no more as slaves, but as sons, and receive a son's portion, the exact recompense which consists of the "inheritance." The juxtaposition of the two ideas of the slave and the inheritance evidently hints at the unspoken thought, that they are heirs because they are sons—a thought which might well lift up bowed backs and brighten dull faces. The hope of that reward came like an angel into the smoky huts and hopeless lives of these poor slaves. It shone athwart all the gloom and squalor, and taught patience beneath "the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely." Through long, weary generations it has lived in the hearts of men driven to God by man's tyranny, and forced to clutch at heaven's brightness to keep them from being made mad by earth's blackness. It may irradiate our poor lives, especially when we fail, as we all do sometimes, to get recognition of our work, or fruit from

it. If we labour for man's appreciation or gratitude, we shall certainly be disappointed; but if for Christ, we have abundant wages beforehand, and we shall have an overabundant requital, the munificence of which will make us more ashamed than anything else could do, of our unworthy service. Christ remains in no man's debt. "Who hath first given, and it shall be recompensed to him again?"

The last word to the slave is a warning against neglect of duty. There is to be a double recompense—to the slave of Christ the portion of a son; to the wrong doer retribution "for the wrong that he has done." Then, though slavery was itself a wrong, though the master who held a man in bondage was himself inflicting the greatest of all wrongs, yet Paul will have the slave think that he still has duties to his master. That is part of Paul's general position as to slavery. He will not wage war against it, but for the present accept it. Whether he saw the full bearing of the gospel on that and other infamous institutions may be questioned. He has given us the principles which will destroy them, but he is no revolutionist, and so his present counsel is to remember the master's rights, even though they be founded on wrong, and he has no hesitation in condemning and predicting retribution for evil things done by a slave to his master. A superior's injustice does not warrant an inferior's breach of moral law, though it may excuse it. Two blacks do not make a white. Herein lies the condemnation of all the crimes which enslaved nations and classes have done, of many a deed which has been honoured and sung, of the sanguinary cruelties of servile revolts, as well as of the questionable means to which labour often resorts in modern industrial warfare. The homely, plain principle, that a man does not receive the right to break God's laws because he is ill-treated, would clear away much fog from some people's notions of how to advance the cause of the oppressed.

But, on the other hand, this warning may look towards the masters also ; and probably the same double reference is to be discerned in the closing words to the slaves, “and there is no respect of persons.” The servants were naturally tempted to think that God was on their side, as indeed He was, but also to think that the great coming day of judgment was mostly meant to be terrible to tyrants and oppressors, and so to look forward to it with a fierce un-Christian joy, as well as with a false confidence built only on their present misery. They would be apt to think that God did “respect persons,” in the opposite fashion from that of a partial judge—namely, that He would incline the scale in favour of the ill-used, the poor, the down-trodden ; that they would have an easy test and a light sentence, while His frowns and His severity would be kept for the powerful and the rich who had ground the faces of the poor and kept back the hire of the labourer. It was therefore a needful reminder for them, and for us all, that that judgment has nothing to do with earthly condition, but only with conduct and character ; that sorrow and calamity here do not open heaven’s gates hereafter, and that the slave and master are tried by the same law.

The series of precepts closes with a brief but most pregnant word to masters. They are bid to give to their slaves “that which is just and equal,” that is to say, “equitable.” A startling criterion for a master’s duty to a slave who was denied to have any rights at all. They were chattels, not persons. A master might, in regard to them, do what he liked with his own ; he might crucify or torture, or commit any crime against manhood either in body or soul, and no voice would question or forbid. How astonished Roman lawgivers would have been if they could have heard Paul talking about justice and equity as applied to a slave ! What a strange new dialect it must have sounded to the slave-owners in the Colossian Church !

They would not see how far the principle, thus quietly introduced, was to carry succeeding ages; they could not dream of the great tree that was to spring from this tiny seed-precept; but no doubt the instinct which seldom fails an unjustly privileged class, would make them blindly dislike the exhortation, and feel as if they were getting out of their depth when they were bid to consider what was "right" and "equitable" in their dealings with their slaves.

He does not define what *is* "right and equal." That will come. The main thing is to drive home the conviction that there are duties owing to slaves, inferiors, employés. We are far enough from a satisfactory discharge of these yet; but, at any rate, everybody now admits the principle—and we have mainly to thank Christianity for that. Slowly the general conscience is coming to recognise that simple truth more and more clearly, and its application is becoming more decisive with each generation. There is much to be done before society is organized on that principle, but the time is coming—and till it is come, there will be no peace. All masters and employers of labour, in their mills and warehouses, are bid to base their relations to "hands" and servants on the one firm foundation of "justice." Paul does not say, Give your servants what is kind and patronising. He wants a great deal more than that. Charity likes to come in and supply the wants which would never have been felt had there been equity. An ounce of justice is sometimes worth a ton of charity.

This duty of the masters is enforced by the same thought which was to stimulate the servants to their tasks: "ye also have a Master in heaven." That is not only stimulus, but it is pattern. I said that Paul did not specify what was just and right, and that his precept might therefore be objected to as vague. Does the introduction of this thought of the master's Master in heaven, take away any of the vagueness? If Christ is our Master, then we are to look

to Him to see what a master ought to be, and to try to be masters like that. That is precise enough, is it not? That grips tight enough, does it not? Give your servants what you expect and need to get from Christ. If we try to live that commandment for twenty-four hours, it will probably not be its vagueness of which we complain.

“Ye have a Master in heaven,” is the great principle on which all Christian duty reposes. Christ’s command is my law, His will is supreme, His authority absolute, His example all-sufficient. My soul, my life, my all are His. My will is not my own. My possessions are not my own. My life is not my own. All duty is elevated into obedience to Him, and obedience to Him, utter and absolute, is dignity and freedom. We are Christ’s slaves, for He has bought us for Himself, by giving Himself for us. Let that great sacrifice win our heart’s love and our perfect submission. “O Lord, truly I am Thy servant, Thou hast loosed my bonds.” Then all earthly relationships will be fulfilled by us, and we shall move among men breathing blessing and raying out brightness, when in all, we remember that we have a Master in heaven, and do all our work from the soul as to Him and not to men.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF HEINRICH EWALD.

II.—HIS WEAKNESS AND HIS STRENGTH, AS A CRITIC AND AS A MAN.

COULD that true prophet who saw Israel’s past so much more clearly than his own life or his own time, have looked back with purged eyes on this point of his career, he might have taken up the words of a poet-prophet who went before him: “Midway the journey of our life, I found myself in a dark forest; for the straight way was lost.” Short

though sharp was his mental agony, and then, like Dante, he saw the hill close by with its shining summit, for which all his life through he had been making. And as he "took his way on the *desert* strand,"—for who was there that rightly shared his aim?—and was now at the point to climb, three cruel forms appeared from the recesses of the wood, seeking to "drive him back to where the sun was mute." That is to say, arbitrary political power, blind theological conservatism, and recklessly destructive criticism, were agreed, as Ewald thought, in fearing and in seeking to oppose the regeneration of Old Testament studies. The story of Ewald's mistakes and half-mistakes is not on the outside indeed as poetic, but quite as tragic, as that of Dante's, and no one will form a right judgment of it unless he recognises, first, that from Ewald's point of view his apprehensions were justified, and next, that, however we may blame his arrogance towards man, we must admire and reverence his constant sense of dependence on God. The one was the source of his weakness; the other, of his strength. But for his faith and his unworldliness, he could not, even with his great talents, have done as much and seen as clearly as he did. He was his own worst enemy; he would have attained, even as a scholar, more uniformly substantial results, had he worked more in concert with others. But his fidelity to the voice within was absolute, and I have no doubt that when he says that he will joyfully recant his whole system, if "a man of insight and of conscience" can prove it to be necessary, his profession is an honest one. But observe the qualification, "insight and—conscience." He is not only a born critic, but a born "apologist"; in one place he candidly says that, though "Apologete" is a "Tübinger Schimpfname," he will accept the description. Ewald cannot tolerate in Biblical matters a perfectly dry criticism. In all his work upon the Old Testament he is partly thinking of the New, which

he regards, too completely even for some orthodox critics, as the crown and climax of the Old. He cannot admit the usual division of the field of exegesis between professors of the Old and professors of the New Testament. He must himself have a hand in the development of New Testament studies, not (as has been sometimes said), in opposition to Baur and Strauss, but because to him the New Testament forms the second part of the record of Israel's revelation. This can be proved, I think, by chronology. As long ago as 1828, before Baur had begun to touch the New Testament, Ewald published a Latin commentary on the Apocalypse. This work is at any rate more solid and significant than that of his old master, Eichhorn, and contributed to bring about that sound historical interpretation now so generally current, that Prof. Harnack, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, can describe the Apocalypse as the most intelligible book in the New Testament. Writing it was Ewald's amusement amidst the serious linguistic studies which preceded his Hebrew Grammar: "unter hundert Bedrängnissen jener Jahre wie in eiligen Nebenstunden verfasst." But not all the brilliant successes of F. C. Baur as an author and as a teacher could tempt his self-centred colleague to compete with him on the field of the New Testament. In 1850 Ewald did indeed break through the appointed order of his works, and express himself on the three first Gospels; the book appeared in a second edition, which included the Acts of the Apostles, in 1871. But though its first appearance was opportune from the point of view of "apologetic" criticism, the bias of Ewald being distinctly "positive," i.e. inclining him to believe that we have firm ground beneath us in the Gospels in a higher degree than Baur could admit, it was neither Baur nor Strauss who forced him, almost, as he says, against his will,¹ to anticipate the time for speaking his mind on the

¹ *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, Vorrede, S. iii.

Gospels. It was his concern for those ideal goods which Germany seemed to him to be losing. What Ewald dreaded, was the spirit of the revolution, and the chief reason why he so disliked Baur and Strauss was, that he thought *their* "Tendenz" revolutionary. Not, however, till 1861 did he touch the fourth Gospel, by denying the traditional authorship of which riled, as Ewald thought, the "most attractive" product of the whole Biblical literature. Here, however, too, as in all Ewald's works, there is no directly controversial element. No one hates controversy more than this critic. *Nachempfinden* (Ewald's own word), was his motto from the first. It was the spell with which, even as a youth, he conjured the monsters of extreme criticism; and though later on he somewhat changed his mind as to friends and foes, never did he cease to insist upon a direct relation between the expositor and his author, a relation so close and sympathetic as to exclude any great care for the opinions of others. If he feared radicalism more as represented by Baur than by Vatke, it was because he thought that there was a fatal, however undesigned, connexion between the conclusions of Baur and of his too brilliant friend, David F. Strauss, and the revolutionary excesses of 1848. Vatke, by his heavy style and by the slight echo which he found in German universities, seemed sufficiently guarded against by those general warnings given by our arch-dogmatist, not only in his prefaces, but, as it seems, also in his lectures.¹ Once begun, there was no intermission in his New Testament work. The *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* appeared in 1857; the second volume of the *Johannäischen Schriften* in 1862; and ten years later we find the books of the New Testament complete in seven volumes, which, in spite of their deficiencies, will never quite lose their interest, from the peculiar cha-

¹ Benecke, *Wilhelm Vatke*, p. 613. In 1835, however, Ewald judged more favourably of Vatke's book. *Ibid.*, pp. 168-175.

acter of the author, and from the Hebraistic eye with which, even when writing his first Grammar, he regarded the New Testament writings.

Thus, while fully admitting that Ewald's New Testament work lost something through his antipathy to Baur, I am bound to deny that it was in any sense inspired by that too vehement feeling. So far as his researches on the Synoptic Gospels had any controversial reference, they may be said to have been his answer to the Revolution. It is true they were more than this, and in explaining my allusion, I resume the thread of my narrative. The publication of *Die drei ersten Evangelien* in 1850 was a sign that Ewald was thoroughly settled again in his old university. Much as he feared and hated the revolutionary movement, he had at least to thank what he somewhere calls the shipwreck year for bringing him back to port. Ill at ease, both on public and on private grounds, and equally unable to assimilate the Biblical mysticism and the speculative rationalism of Tübingen, he had resigned his post in the great southern theological university. The senate of the Georgia Augusta supported an application which he himself made for his recall, and in September, 1848, Ewald resumed his old position at Göttingen. His reputation as a scholar had certainly not diminished during his absence. I have spoken of his *Die Propheten*. On the completion of this work, he began one of much wider range, the greatest of all the great Göttingen histories; need I mention the *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*? On two grounds this work is fitly described as epoch-making. It is in the highest degree original; every line exhibits a fresh and independent mind, and mature and long-tested research. It is also, if you will allow the expression, in a scarcely less degree, unoriginal. It sums up the investigations and discoveries of a century, and closes provisionally that great movement which, beginning as it did with Lowth, ought to have been through-

out Anglo-continental. Twenty years hence, when the next great history of Israel will be due, may we venture to hope for a native English Ewald? Great is our need of him. The old Ewald must in England be for the most part the teacher's teacher; peculiarities of style and of exposition, not unpleasing to those who are interested in the author personally, are real hindrances to beginners. The new Ewald will be born into a world which is not so academical as that of Heinrich Ewald. He must be free at all costs from the moral drawbacks of his predecessor, and must have an English as well as a German training. A mere wish will not bring him into existence, but a strong enough wish will be the parent of action. Unless we see our goal, we shall never shake off our guilty torpor. Therefore—

Flash on us, all in armour, thou Achilles;
Make our hearts dance to thy resounding steps.¹

You will pardon this abrupt transition. The memory of Lowth, whose books fell dead in England, but kindled a flame in Germany, pursues me. The time may have come for us to take a step forward. Our Theological Honour Examination, on which Ewald would have cast a cool and questioning glance, has this merit, that it recognises, though not sufficiently, the primary importance of the historical study of the Bible. It is, I think, the duty of historical theologians to follow the bright example of persistence in urging their just claims set by their colleagues in another faculty. But now to return. I am not asking you to accept Ewald blindly. Delitzsch is my friend as well as Ewald; neither is my Pope. There was a time when Ewald was in some quarters both at home and abroad almost an unquestioned potentate, the Ranke of Hebrew history. I have no wish to revive the belief in his infallibility. Over and over again we shall have to fight with

¹ Browning, *Paracelsus*.

him, but let us mind that we do so in his own spirit and with his own weapons. Do you ask what *is* Ewald's spirit? "To be scientific"—he tells us himself—is to have a burning desire to push on more and more towards the high goal which science has set up, and to come from certainty to certainty.¹ But the goal with Ewald is the knowledge of a self-revealing God ("they go from strength to strength, and appear before God in Zion"); Delitzsch postulates this, Ewald works towards it. Do you ask, next, which are Ewald's weapons? I reply in the words of Niebuhr, "History has two means by which it supplies the deficiencies of its sources—criticism and divination." "Both are arts," he continues, "which may certainly be acquired from masters, and which a man must himself understand before he can judge of their productions."² Niebuhr, I know, is said to be superseded, and Ewald is, at least in one sense, in course of being superseded. But the man who finally supersedes him will only do so in virtue of a more penetrating criticism and a better regulated though not more intense divination. Lord Acton, in the *Historical Review* (No. 1, p. 25), has lately said, "It is the last and most original of [Ewald's] disciples . . . who has set in motion" the new Pentateuch controversy, and Julius Wellhausen himself inscribes his now famous work, "To my unforgotten teacher, Heinrich Ewald." Wellhausen as a critic may be right or wrong, but he cannot be appreciated without a true knowledge of the influences which formed him. In one sense he has no doubt broken with his master. He has identified himself with that "so-called criticism" (Ewald's phraseology) which has "given up Moses and so much that is excellent besides," and which

¹ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der ältesten Auslegung*, by Ewald and Dukes, p. xviii.

² "Essay on the Study of Antiquities," in Niebuhr's *Life and Letters*, ii. 219.

leads on directly to the contemptuous rejection of the Old Testament, if not also of the New (again, Ewald's phraseology). It is a proof of the moral and intellectual force of the *History of the People of Israel*, that the last extreme critical hypothesis did not become a power in Germany thirty years earlier. Strauss's *Leben Jesu* coincides in date of publication with more than one remarkable work which anticipates the ideas of Julius Wellhausen. It was a subversive influence of the first order; Vatke's *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments* was not. Vatke, it is true, had not the pointed pen of David F. Strauss; still the Carlylian denunciations of Ewald's prefaces would have been a too ineffectual breakwater by themselves. Ewald dies, and Wellhausen sets all Germany in a flame, commits treason, as Lord Acton calls it, against his old master. In another sense, however, Wellhausen is a faithful disciple of Ewald, whose principles he does but apply more audaciously and with different results. We will not indeed bow down to him, lest he should prove a Dagon, and we should lose our faith in truth and progress. We will not even criticize him—it would be a tragic waste of time—till we understand him, and if Ewald is hard for most Englishmen to appreciate, Wellhausen is harder. Two things are certain, however. The first is that Wellhausen is not a match for his predecessor on the field of exegesis—*impar congressus Achilli*. Who can point to another series of works so full of well-ordered exegetical details as that of Heinrich Ewald's? And the second is that our critic possesses in a far higher degree than his successor the quality of reverence. He loves criticism as much as Wellhausen. But in the one you can see, and in the other you cannot see, at least not distinctly see, that criticism is regarded only as a steppingstone to a higher degree of religious insight. I do think myself that Ewald would have "found the root of the matter" in his old pupil; but in

order to arrive at this charitable conclusion (which obviously does not carry with it the acceptance of the new criticism) we must stand where Ewald stood, and he who would do this, or catch the quintessence of his spirit, must resort to the most comprehensive of his works, the *History of the People of Israel*.

It is in short most earnestly to be wished that Ewald may in one sense of the word be superseded. The range of his researches was too wide; his self-confidence too strong; his deficiency in dialectic power too complete. But never will his great historical work be out of date as a monument of the union of faith and criticism. From this point of view I recommend it to all theological students. His original idea was to bring the narrative down to the time of Christ. It took nine years to complete the publication on this limited scale, the first volume being published in 1813, the fourth in 1852; in 1848 a supplementary volume was given on the *Antiquities of Israel*. The work has a most admirable introduction, worthy to be put by the side of the introduction to the Prophets. Our excellent apologists who are defending ultra-conservatism against Julius Wellhausen, would have done well to practise themselves on such a work as this. Other men have been as distinguished as Ewald in the analytic department of criticism; but no one yet has been his equal in the synthesis of critical material—he is an architect of the first order. I know that there are two great faults in that part of the Introduction which relates to the sources. One is common to Ewald with most of his contemporaries—it is the comparative neglect of the archaeological side of Pentateuch-research; the other is a peculiarity of his own—it is his somewhat arbitrary treatment of the component parts of the Hexateuch, and his perplexing nomenclature. But I also know that the literary analysis to which Ewald much confined himself has produced some assured and permanent results, and that his analysis is not

really so very divergent from that of his fellow-critics; his dogmatism in this particular is less misleading than might be supposed.

I am unwilling to stir the ashes of smouldering controversies. But there is another serious fault, as I know but too well, which still attaches to Ewald in many minds. Undevout he cannot be said to be. Prof. Wilkins has rightly emphasized Ewald's piety as well as his profundity and eloquence.¹ Our critic never treats the Old Testament as if he were a medical student dissecting the dead. He believes that the religion of Israel was the "nascent religion" of humanity in quite another sense from that in which the philosophy of Greece was its "nascent philosophy." He reveres, nay loves, the great personalities of the Old Testament; he even almost makes the anonymous historical writers live before us. But his treatment of the miracles has shocked some religious minds. Even Erskine of Linlathen speaks of Ewald in one of his letters as giving "the history of Israel divested of miracle, and (Israel) as a nation choosing God, not chosen by God."² All that is true, however, is that Ewald has no scholastic theory of miracles, and that to him as a historian the fact is not the miracle but the narrative of a miraculous occurrence. Those who wish to know more can now refer to Ewald's own brief treatment of the subject of miracles in the second part of the third volume of his great work on Biblical Theology. There, however, he speaks predominantly as a theologian; in his *History of the People of Israel* he speaks, and ought to speak, as a historian.

Time forbids me to enter into a detailed examination of Ewald's greatest work. I spoke in my first lecture of his love of high ideas. This is one source of the attraction which he exercises; it is not however without its dangers. It tempts him to idealize certain great periods of Israel's

¹ *Phœnicia and Israel*, p. 148.

² *Letters*, p. 407.

history, as for example the age of Moses, and the age of David and Solomon. I am afraid that cooler students of the Old Testament, such as Kuenen and Oort, are needed to criticize him. The latter for instance has pointed out what a *petitio principii* it is to make the volume on the Antiquities of Israel an appendix to the history of the judges and the early kings, as if the customs and institutions, as well as the beliefs of the people, underwent no change in the following centuries.¹ But it is not a member of the Leyden critical school, it is the coryphæus of the later orthodox theology, Dr. Dorner himself, who complains, perhaps too strongly, that "the internal and religious history of Old Testament development is not brought out by Ewald," and that "the religious matter of the Old Testament, the Messianic idea not excepted, dwindles in his writings into a few general abstract truths, devoid of life and motion," and that "he fails to perceive the progress of the history of revelation, and its internal connexion with that national feeling which prepared for it,"² in short, that Ewald has not entirely thrown off the weaknesses of the eighteenth century. Dr. Dorner speaks as it were out of the soul of this generation; it is something to have welcomed the discoveries of Darwin and to have lived in the same capital with Leopold von Ranke.³

With his fourth volume (the fifth in the English translation) Ewald arrives at the original goal of his narrative. There is no period in the earlier history of Israel in which so much still remains to be done as that which extends from the Exile to the Birth of Jesus Christ. It is no discredit to Ewald that his volume, full of interest as it is, presents

¹ Oort, *De tegenwoordige toestand der israelit. oudheidskunde*. (Redevoering aan het Athenæum illustre te Amsterdam den 31 Maart, 1873.)

² *History of Protestant Theology*, ii. 437.

³ "The historical spirit among the rising generation of German clergymen is chiefly due to his fostering care" (Max Müller). May we some day be enabled to use such words of an English Dorner!

considerable *lacune*. How imperfect for instance, in spite of its masterly grouping, is his treatment of Philo! We must henceforth look to the co-operation of Jewish and Christian scholars for the filling up of these gaps. Ewald was not as friendly as could be wished to Jewish scholars, and much work, not indeed of equal solidity, has been done in this field since Ewald's last revision of his fourth volume.

By his *Geschichte Christus*, Ewald distinctly affirmed the view, which is not indeed the only tenable one, but which is the only possible one to a Christian, that Israel's history culminates in Jesus Christ. He showed in it that he was not inclined to withhold his opinion on the great and burning questions of our time. Great are its faults; great also are its merits. Ewald as a historian reminds us here something of Maurice as a philosopher. It is an expository sermon on a grand scale that he gives us; it is not a history. Nowhere is Ewald's literary criticism so disputable as in the introduction to the Synoptic Gospels published in the second edition of *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, and presupposed in the *Geschichte Christus*. English readers, however, will perhaps not be severe upon him; indeed, he shares some of his faults (so far as they are faults) with other respected German theologians of different schools, such as Neander and Carl Hase. I say, so far as they are faults; for to me, as to Ewald, a historical biography of the Christian Messiah is a thing which cannot be written. The sources are too incomplete, and a Christian has too strong a bias to complete them by divination.

Let us take breath awhile. The *History of the People of Israel* was completed in 1859; the dream of his youth was fulfilled. Soon after this he took another holiday in England, when I believe he paid a visit to one who in some respects was very like him, and with whom he sympathised, Dr. Rowland Williams, at Broadchalke. It would have been well if Ewald could oftener have allowed himself

these distractions. I like not to criticise his personal character. But that serene atmosphere which envelops all his New Testament work did not penetrate his outward life as we could wish. Had he but enjoyed the same deep religious experience as Tholuck, for instance, or Franz Delitzsch, that most humble-minded, most Christian-minded of great critics; had he, moreover, but shared their satisfied longing after the brotherly fellowship of the Church, how differently would his inward and consequently also his outward history have shaped itself! It is all the sadder, because of the noble words on the past, present, and future of the great rival Western communions contained in the appendix to *Die poetischen Bücher* (vol. iv. 1837), which I had marked to read to you. All the sadder, because there were in Ewald, as these passages seem to me to show, the germs of better things. Lucian Müller has remarked that the life of a German philologist is, by the necessity of the case, uneventful. I wish that Ewald's life had been more uneventful. He became in his latter years more irritable than ever, and more unwise in the expression of his opinions. His Hanoverian patriotism too led him astray. He had never forgotten nor forgiven the violent conduct of Prussia towards Hanover in 1801 and 1806, and on the annexation of Hanover in 1866 he refused, on conscientious grounds, to take the oath to the king of Prussia. For a long time no notice was taken of this privileged offender; but after much provocation on Ewald's part, he was placed on the retired list, with the full amount of his salary for pension. There is a curious irony in the concatenation of events by which the very man whom a Guelph deprived, was now again dismissed from office for loyalty to the Guelphs. The truth is, however, that he was treated very leniently, but unfortunately became the tool of his party. He might have done almost as good work as ever; he might perhaps have been alive now; had not his friends ("amici quam parum

amici," as Casaubon says) formed the desperate resolution of sending this most unpractical, because most unpromising,¹ of men as the Guelphian representative of Hanover to the German Reichstag. Let us draw a veil over the melancholy issue of that ill-advised step, but respect the sense of duty which would not let him "brood over the languages of the dead," when, as he thought, "forty millions of Germans were suffering oppression."

The last short chapter in Ewald's life is at hand. But I must not open it without some inadequate lines, which I would gladly make fuller, on the most recent of his works, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, the first volume of which has been translated into English under the title, *Revelation, its Nature and Record*. The publication began in 1871, and the printing of the last volume was only finished after Ewald's death. It is not often that a man's time is so exactly proportioned to the life-work which he has set himself to do. This book too had to be written, if the depths of truth in the Holy Scriptures were to be fully explored. You remember, perhaps, how in 1844 two young Oxford students, one of them named Stanley, called upon Ewald at Dresden. They never forgot the noble enthusiasm with which this dangerous heretic, as he was then regarded in England, grasped the small Greek Testament which he held in his hand, and said, "In this little book is contained all the wisdom of the world."² This was the spirit in which Ewald wrote his grandly conceived work on one of the subjects of the future, Biblical Theology. He wrote it, as you will have observed, at a time of much anxiety, both on public and on private grounds. The war

¹ Heinrich Thierack indeed, sees nothing but good in the rigid consistency of Ewald: "Dieses seltenen Mannes, der in dieser Zeit des Verfalles der Charaktere, da die Vertreter der verschiedenen Partheien wetteifern, ihren Grundsätzen untreu zu werden, fest und ungebeugt dastand, unter der Menge der haltlosen ein christlicher Cato."

² Stanley, *Jewish Church*, vol. iii. Preface, p. 17.

with France stirred him greatly; and much as he disliked the French, he had no confidence in the rulers of his country. Still he worked on, though the excitement of the time hindered consecutive thought and the clear expression of his ideas.

But however faulty this work may be, as compared with the great *History of Israel*, it has special claims on the notice of all who are interested in theology. First, because its design is a practical one. Strange as it may seem, Ewald writes here for the great public. He thinks, poor dreamer, that the men of this world will attend to a system based on the historical study of the Bible. Like Maurice, he is persuaded that even in the Old Testament truths are contained which the world cannot afford to neglect. He does touch, however clumsily and ineffectually, on some of the great subjects of the day. He does not bury himself in his study, like too many German divines, but seeks to bring himself into relation with the people and its wants. He began in 1863, by co-operating with others, including the great theologian, Richard Rothe, in founding the "Protestanten-Verein"; he now, with his old prophet-like confidence, offers that which he has found in the Bible as "a banner because of the truth." And next, because the book suggests to us a new criterion of the relative importance of doctrines. Do they stand in a line of direct continuity with the Old Testament? We may not altogether agree with Ewald's results, or with Ritschl's,¹ but they have both done good service in pointing us back to the roots of theology in the Old Testament. Lastly, however weak as a theological system—and remember that Ewald, almost alone among famous theologians, had no special philosophical training²

¹ Albrecht Ritschl, author of *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, the most independent and influential of living German theologians.

² He might almost pass for English in his repugnance to modern German philosophy (see e.g. *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 45, note 1).

—the book is full of suggestive exegetical details, combined with something of the old architectonic skill. The right hand of the veteran scholar has not forgotten its cunning; and on this and other grounds, I think that the translation of the first volume is of primary importance, not only to teachers, but to students.

To the last Ewald remained in outward bearing as he had ever been. No one who has once seen it will forget that tall, erect form, and those eyes which seemed to pierce into eternity. His loss as an academical teacher was not greatly felt. His enthusiasm had not cooled, but it ceased to attract students. A few, however, I believe, still came to his rooms for Oriental teaching; and to the last he followed with interest the course of Oriental philology. Four days before his death he sent in a paper on a Phœnician inscription, for a meeting of the Göttingen *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*. His last sickness he took with resignation, supported, we are told, by high thoughts of eternity. His child-like faith never left him. "There he sat," says one who visited him, "in his long grey fur-trimmed gown, in the little green upper chamber. On the walls hung, not only copies of two well-known modern paintings, but the Saviour of the World by Carlo Dolce." "His words" (so my author continues) "were full of a bold assurance that took no account of earthly opposition."¹ He died May 4, 1875, leaving us not only his example but his spirit. (For has not Milton told us that books are the life-blood of noble spirits?) Let us take warning from his errors, but imitate him in all that is good, as he followed Truth and followed Christ.

¹ *Einsame Wege* (1881), an anonymous work by a leading Lutheran divine, pp. 300, 301.

A COMPLETE LIFE.

“ I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days : Thy years are throughout all generations.”—PSALM cii. 21.

THIS is a prayer which springs from the bosom of the Old Testament, and it bears the impress of its time. Life and immortality had not yet been brought to light ; and long life in the land which the Lord their God had given them was a special promise made to these ancient saints. The prayer looks to that promise. The man asks that he may not be cut off prematurely from the work and enjoyment of life in this world. It is thus the request for a complete life. But he is a believing man who submits his wish to the will of God, and who is ready to accept life in the form in which God orders it. He feels that there can be no real life without God, but that with Him it is certain to have a perfect and happy issue. In such a prayer, then, a future and eternal life is implied. The desire for it is struggling in the man's soul, though the full vision of it has not yet opened before him. When the Gospel comes, and shows us eternal life in Jesus Christ, it merely unfolds into flower and fruit the germ which is already contained here. We shall avail ourselves of the light of the Gospel to explain what the meaning of this prayer is, and on what ground it is urged. Our subject briefly stated, then, is—A Complete Life, and the Plea for it.

I. When is it that a Life may be said to be Complete ?

Here we may observe, that while length of life in this world is not the chief blessing of the New Testament, there is nothing wrong in desiring it, and that, when well used, it may have on it special marks of God's wisdom and kindness. The love of life is natural, for God has given us a strong attachment to the world where our eyes have first opened on this beautiful earth and pleasant sunlight. He has surrounded us with families and friends, whose love makes

existence sweet. There are duties to be performed in which we feel we are needed, and spiritual interests to be fixed and promoted before we enter with full acquiescence on the great and untried scenes that lie beyond. Length of days, like every other possession, like power, or wealth, or intellect, is a gift to be employed in God's service—the woof on which a good man may weave valuable material, and many rich and fair colours. And yet we must remember that long life has not always been granted to some of God's truest friends. Even in the Old Testament there is the lesson that a complete life does not need to be a prolonged one ; the very first death recorded, that of Abel the righteous, was sudden and premature. Enoch lived but a short time on earth compared with his contemporaries, and Elijah was called away before his natural powers had failed. It is enough to recall Abijah the son of Jeroboam, and the good Josiah, and to mention, above all, that our Lord and Master, the central life of God's entire Word, was cut off long ere He had reached the mid-time of His days. It is necessary, then, in speaking of a complete life, to find those elements that will suit either him who has come to his grave in a full age, or the young who have been taken away in the beginning of their days. We thank God that in His Word we can find a goal where the old and the young may meet in a complete and perfect life.

The first thing needed to gain this is that a man should have lived long enough to secure God's favour. Until he has found this he has not attained the great end for which life has been given to an intelligent and responsible creature. Whatever else a man may possess in this world—its power, its fame, its riches, its learning—if he has not entered into the favour of God, if he is not living in His fellowship, he has not seen life. Its palace gate has not been opened to him, its light has not visited his eye, its pulse has not begun to beat in his heart. He is less the possessor of what he

calls his own than Belshazzar was of his kingdom when his dethronement was being written on his palace wall ; as little as a dead Pharaoh in his pyramid was lord of the treasures of Egypt. The favour of God alone can make anything on earth truly ours, and truly good ; can give, to what is good, permanence, and render it a foretaste of things infinitely better. Whensoever a man dies without this, he is taken away in the midst of his days, hurried out of existence before he has secured its one grand prize. Death draws the curtain at midnight and breaks his dream : “ Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee ; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided ? ” But if God’s favour has been gained, we can rejoice in the blessed equality of all who reach it. “ The child dies an hundred years old ; ” the youth comes to his grave “ in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in, in his season.” We lament early Christian deaths as untimely, but, in that favour of God which is life, every term attains maturity. Some find the gate of heaven by a short path, while others enter after long years of toil and travel. While some of us continue careful and cumbered about many things—an honourable work if we do not complain of it—there are those who go in and sit down at once at the feet of Christ, when they have found “ the one thing needful, the good part which shall not be taken away.” Let me ask myself, Can I say that death shall find my life thus complete ? There is but one way of assurance. It is through laying hold of that Saviour of whom it is said, “ Ye are complete in Him ; ” who offers Himself freely to our acceptance with the words, “ He that findeth Me, findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord.”

A complete life has this in it still further, that it has done God and His world some service. We are here not merely to find God’s favour, but to do God’s work, to be followers of Christ, who said, “ I must work the works of Him who sent Me, while it is day.” His was the one great perfect

life, which never spared a labour, never missed an opportunity, and looking back on which He could say so calmly, "It is finished." How far we are from filling up that model! How ready, while the bridegroom tarries, to slumber and sleep, and awake with a start because we have let the supreme moment take us unawares! And, therefore, there are degrees of completeness even in Christian lives. They all reach the haven, but some of them with fuller sail and richer freight. The salvation in the great day will be to all God's people of free grace, and yet we must believe that its rest will be sweeter to the wearied labourer, and the enjoyment greater to him who brings home sheaves which are the fruit of tears and toil. "They joy before Him according to the joy of the harvest." But withal, and in view of those who have reaped long and largely, it is a comfort to think that no true Christian life is passed in vain. God will not terminate it till it can appear before Him in Christ's own spirit, "Behold, I and the children whom Thou hast given Me." Stephen's Christian life was short, and yet what ends it gained! The dying thief's was still shorter, but how many sermons his words have preached to dying men! The child that Christ takes into His arms, through death, from its mother's bosom, can be made to draw the heart to the heavenly kingdom, and when we can do no work, but only lie passive in His keeping, we may be fulfilling purposes of far-reaching wisdom and mercy. It is a view of the coming judgment as wonderfully tender as sublime, that what Christians forget, Christ remembers, and reckons up, as done to Himself—the cup of cold water given in His name. It may stir us up, if we are indolent, to be active; it may persuade us, if we are weak and helpless, to lie resignedly still; it may encourage us to cast over our imperfect past His perfect righteousness, and to dedicate our feeble all to His service, when we have the assurance that whether the life be long

or short, He will make it "neither barren nor unfruitful in the day of the Lord Jesus."

The next thing we mention in a complete life is that it should close with submission to the call of God. Even a good man may not always be ready for this. Warm hearts and active natures are sometimes so interested in the friends and work around them, that it is hard to find an open place for parting. The speaker in this psalm felt it so, and Hezekiah likewise when he wept sore against the door of death. Yet God has His own way of making such as these resigned, and He doubtless does it in the secret of His presence, when we cannot hear their words of consent. But it is more pleasant to us when we hear from the lips, or see from the bearing, the act of self-surrender. Joseph reached it when he said so simply and quietly, "I die, and God will surely visit you;" and Moses, when leaving his great labour and wish unfinished, he looked up and touched completeness in that word, "Thou art a Rock, Thy work is perfect." We have lived long enough when we can tranquilly give up the problem we have been working at to God, that He may complete it—when we can rest assured that He will still be a God to us, and to our friends, though He makes death for awhile divide our paths; and that His way to the triumph of His cause can be over the graves of His servants, with a banner that never droops though the hands of all of us relax their hold. This submission may be gained through the long experience of the Christian life; it may be witnessed in the quiet peace with which the setting sun falls aslant on the softened look and silver hair, but it is granted often to those who close their eyes on a beautiful dawn, or bright noonday, as unrepiningly as if they had seen all God's goodness in the land of the living. There is a dew of youth that exhales in sunlight, as there is a dew of nightfall that waits for the morning. It comes, like God's dew, always from a clear sky, and tells of His com-

pleted work. The man is not torn from life but loosed. He signs his own name beneath God's discharge, and goes to other work which is ready for him. The great Roman general gathered his robes round him, under the strokes of his enemies, covered his face, and sank like a conqueror rather than a victim. But in that same Rome there was a nobler farewell to life when the Apostle said, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand;" and when he invited all to share in it "who love Christ's appearing." For still, when any one has learned at God's call to gather in human desires and hopes, and to put them in His hand, and has been seen, not with covered but open face, to meet the last enemy, his life is complete, for he is ready and willing to die.

The last thing we mention in a complete life is that it should look forward to a continual life with God. Without this, all we have spoken of would be incomplete. What estimate can I set on God's favour if it lifts me up to the view of Divine loving-kindness, only to let me fall into nothingness? What deep interest can I be taking in the cause of truth and righteousness, if I have no care about seeing its progress and triumph? And how can I be ready to give up my earthly life at God's call, if I am bidding an eternal farewell to God Himself? Would it not be of all things the most imperfect and unnatural that a man should be a friend of God, and take delight in approaching to Him, and conversing with His thoughts as they speak to us in His Word and in His works, and that the man should feel, at every moment, that all this can be broken off for ever? that he should have a view of a universe of truth and beauty and goodness, opening up through parting clouds—of a divine purpose working to a far-off end which he knows and feels must come, and that he should lay down his head in the dust of utter forgetfulness, and be willing to have it so? Then, the higher the form of life the more miserable

its issue. There are many bitter farewells in our world, but we can bear them all if we do not need to bid farewell to God; for to live with Him is to preserve the hope which shall restore all we meanwhile lose. But the thought of such a farewell has in it the proof that its reality is impossible. Where God shows His face, opens His heart, to a man, it is the seal of eternal life. This gift and calling of God is without repentance. And herein we have the assurance of the final completeness of a life. There is room here for rectifying all that is wrong, for supplying all that is wanting, for doing to us above all that we ask or think. It meets the longest life and the shortest with the same promise of perfection. Our night taper lasts long enough if it lets in the eternal day. "He asked life of Thee, and Thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever."

II. We come now to consider the Plea for a Complete Life which this prayer contains.

The Psalmist contrasts his days with God's years, his being cut off in the midst of his days with those years that are throughout all generations. There is deep pathos in it, a sense of his own utter frailty and evanescence. And yet in the heart of it there is faith and hope. It is an appeal to God as the possessor of a complete life in the most absolute sense, the inhabitant and owner of eternity. "Thou hast Thine own perfect and everlasting existence; give to Thy creature a share in it, according to his nature. He thirsts for life and comes to the fountain of it. Here in Thy world, or elsewhere, if it may be, let him live in Thy universe and look up to Thyself." In putting this plea beside the prayer, we do not in any way strain the meaning of the passage. Let any one read this psalm attentively, and he will feel that this is its entire bearing. We have a man to whom life, as he sees it, behind and around him, is broken and disappointing. His body, his spirit, his earthly relationships, the cause of God

so dear to his heart, are falling to decay. What can he do but turn to God Himself? What but hold fast by His eternity and unchanging purpose? In the mind of an ancient believer the prayer had reference, first and most clearly, to this present world; in our view it has widened to the full expectation of a world to come. But, by whomsoever presented, it expresses the instinctive aversion of man to give up a conscious and personal existence. It is a cry from the profoundest depths of the soul to be preserved from extinction, and it is a cry to its Maker founded on His nature as the living, everlasting God. Let us look at some thoughts implied in this plea.

1. The eternal life of God suggests the thought of His power to grant this request. He is the possessor of independent and everlasting existence, and can share it with His creatures as seems good to Him. "He only hath immortality," that is, He only, as no one else. It belongs to Him, underived, unconditioned, held by no will, ruled by no law out of Himself. But, as we see, He is a generous giver; it is His nature to be not only living, but life-giving. In His hand is the breath of all that lives, and the soul of all mankind. And they take from Him not so much as the showers of the earth do from the waters of the ocean, or the rays of the sun from the brightness of his orb; for these draw from the substance of their source, but the creatures of God derive being from His will, and leave Him unchanged and unchangeable. No one can rise to this view of God, without feeling that it is in His power to bestow life in higher and more enduring forms than any that are seen around us. Would it not be a most unnatural and irrational limitation of the Eternal Source of being to affirm that He can give origin only to kinds and measures of life such as appear in this world, that He can be the parent merely of creatures that die? If this world shows us the extent of His ability to be the Giver of life, it

may be said that death more than life is the sign of His workmanship. The graves have long since far outnumbered the living inhabitants; and existence, in the highest modes in which we are acquainted with it, is so brief, so troubled, so occupied with thoughts of its own preservation and fears of its extinction, that life can scarcely be enjoyed in the anticipation of the loss of it. An eternal and conscious Author of the world must surely have ability to pass beyond the limits of our narrow experience, and must have some means of answering the cry of His intelligent creatures that "they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly." This cry, so deep, so constant, whence does it come if it is not of His own prompting, and shall not the everlasting God be able to satisfy the desires He suggests? When we think of it thus, the tokens of His quickening and preserving power in nature come to sustain us. We can look not at the side of death but of life in them, at sunrises and springs and perpetual renewals, and we can reason that He who gives life in such wonderful profusion, can bestow it in still more glorious and permanent forms. "O Lord, Thou preservest man and beast. Therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of Thy wings. For with Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light."

2. The eternal being of God suggests the thought of His immutability to secure the request. The unchangeableness of God in the midst of all the changes of our life is a deep source of comfort. Those ancient saints dwelt upon it more than we seem to do, and they were made very strong by it. It consoled them in the absence of the clear view of their own immortality; it was the soil in which the seed of it lay, and to which we should still seek to carry down the roots of our faith. Beneath this shifting face of things, where we look on endless change, there is a great Life that is not only the source but the sustenance of ours, a life

that is not blind and purposeless, but conscious and wise. It is not merely a Life, but an ever-living One, and it is in His bosom that we are born and live and die. We have many deaths before we come to the last—some of them which seem sorer than even the last can be—deaths of desires, deaths of hopes, deaths of friends. And yet, if we have carried them to God, there has come, from these deaths, a life, some new and higher hope, some deeper and richer possession of the soul. Amid these changes we have felt that we were taking in something unchanging, felt, at least, that there was something unchanging which could be taken in. And this may give us the hope that the last change will have a like result, the last death a corresponding life to us. We may have the confidence of this if we realize the thought of an ever-living God, who not only gave being to our souls, but holds them in His hand, and puts into them desires after Himself. All the changes, whether of life or death, cannot affect our relation to Him, except in bringing us nearer. Without an eternal God, what refuge would there be for troubled souls? When the sea is tempest-tossed, we flee to land; when the land quakes, we look to heaven; when all things are dissolved, then to Him who says, “I am the Lord, I change not.” We may lie quietly down in our little earthly homes when we have the overarching sky of God’s hand above us, the shadow of the Almighty; and we may lie down hopefully in our graves, when we commit ourselves to an unchanging God. “The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.”

3. Still further, the thought of God’s eternal being suggests His Divine consistency as an encouragement to this request. He has done so much that we may infer He will, if we ask Him, do still more. Man’s wish for immortality does not, as some say, spring from a mere animal craving, from the love of living on, but from his being made able to

conceive of an endless existence. The lower creatures have no such desire, because they have no such conception. But man can conceive of endless existence as in the possession of one great personal Being, and may plead for it on the ground that he has been made capable of looking forward to it. It could not be his Maker's design to tantalize him with a vision of what is for ever unattainable, to show him the glory of an endless life, and then to say to him, "This shall never be thine—no more of life for thee than this drop with which I now touch thy lips, and which awakens in thee the thirst to live on." What a universe would such a thought present to us! a God who drinks of the golden cup of immortality all alone, in full view of creatures whom He tempts with its sparkle, to whom He shakes some scattered drops from the brim, while they beg for more that they may not die, and beg in vain! For, let it be considered, that the life they ask, if it be a true request, is not a mere life of animal existence. There are ties formed here between soul and soul that cry out for an eternity to be renewed in, and better never to have known hearts so tender and true than to feel that we have bidden them an everlasting farewell. There are questions raised about the problems of being, the wisdom, the justice, the goodness of the arrangements of this universe, which our little life cannot answer, and which knock with an imperious demand at the eternal gate. Above all, there are the aspirations of the spirit after the infinite Friend and Father, for which we thank Him most, if He has stirred them within us, and which we know to be deep realities, longings that draw down Divine bequests, communings which find an answer from a Spirit higher than our own. Are these never to close upon their object, and become something more than glimpses and foretastes?

Let us think, then, with ourselves in this way: I feel when I am in my best moments that these things are to be

the perfection of my nature, if I ever reach it. But I cannot reach it without an immortality. Will not the being who presents me with this aim, and has formed me capable of conceiving of an immortality, grant me the immortality without which the aim can never be reached? When I contemplate Him, I see that His eternity is the enclosing zone, the compact and mighty girdle of all His attributes, without which they would be scattered, conflicting forces, aimless and chaotic and fruitless. And what eternity is to God, immortality is to man. It is the indispensable requisite to the unity and completeness of his being. If, then, God has made Himself my highest standard, His unalterable truth and righteousness and goodness the goal towards which I should press, may I not expect that the course will be opened which leads to the goal? Without this, His attributes would be, for His children, the perpetual object of their despairing gaze. We may plead surely that He who has given us such a Divine plan of life should in His consistency make the term of our life commensurate with it. "O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: Thy years are throughout all generations."

Last of all, let us say that God's eternal being is a plea for this request, because it suggests His Divine compassion for us. Those men who think they exalt God by making Him indifferent to humanity are as far wrong in their philosophy as in their divinity. They speak of Him as so high above us in His infinite nature that He regards us no more than we do the short-lived insects of a summer evening, or the drifting leaves on the autumn winds. But the greatest natures are the most sensitively tender, and a true man has a feeling akin to sympathy for the insect of a day, a touch of pity when he sees the yellow leaf; if not for itself, yet for what it signifies. Great natures are made not more limited by their greatness, but more comprehensive; and the eternity of God does not shut out the

thoughts and trials of human lives, but brings them more within His merciful regard. It is thus the Bible puts it, and it finds an echo in our hearts. "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust." Frail man! "He remembered that they were but flesh, a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again." When we feel a touch of tenderness to the feeble creatures around us, to the bird or butterfly that sings its song, and flutters its hour, and dies, let us not imagine we are more compassionate than God. Every spark of mercy is from His hearth. And when He has put into our souls a sense of a higher life, and a cry for its fulness in Himself, let us not believe He will treat us worse than the beasts that perish, that He will meet their wants in His great liberality and leave ours in endless disappointment.

When we converse with such thoughts as these, when we feel that, short-lived and imperfect as we are, we can conceive of God's eternity, comprehend something of His consistency and compassion, our future life becomes not so much a thing of doubt. It is when we dwell only in dust that dust seems all. And we let the spirit waken and rise to God, it feels its kinship with His eternal nature, till we can say with the prophet, "Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord my God, my Holy One? we shall not die." It is not always that we can realize these truths, but, in the proportion in which we do, we feel them to be the power and blessedness of life. If we have not learned them at all, the shadow of the solemn words of Scripture falls from this world upon eternity, "Without God, without hope." "He is light, and in Him is no darkness at all;" but without Him, the future is "a land of darkness, as darkness itself." The only way to have the hope of a blessed immortality is to have something in our souls which we can reasonably wish to be made immortal, something that is worthy to survive death and earth and time; that is, something of

God within us now. As we live with him here, we have the assurance of living with Him for ever. Where He gives Himself, He gives a share in that eternity which is His home.

We would not leave the subject without saying a word about the full answer to this request. We have been dealing with a question which to some extent involves the answer; and it is well that it should be put in every point of view, in order that, when the answer is finally given, it may be felt to be sufficient. This, indeed, may be one reason why God left the wise men of the old heathen world to deal with this problem on a mere human basis, and why He put it in such different ways into the hearts of His ancient saints by His Holy Spirit—"If a man die, shall he live again?"

It was, no doubt, to fix attention on the great answer, and on Him who has given it. It will require time for this answer to work its way into the world's heart, as it required time to mature the question. But we who profess to be Christians should feel already how it meets the case. Our Saviour Jesus Christ has appeared "to abolish death, and bring life and immortality to light through His Gospel." His earthly history shows us what a complete life is, a life led in no imaginary sphere, but amid the duties and temptations, the pains and sorrows, which daily press upon us. And it was followed by a death which puts us in a position to aim at His life. When we receive it in its Divine meaning, "the Lord our Righteousness," it covers all the sinful past which paralyzes our endeavour, offers us a free pardon that we may serve God as His reconciled children, and secures that Holy Spirit who is the Giver of life, and who works all our works in us. And, what is most wonderful, while He was accomplishing all this, it was in a way that never removes Him out of the reach of our experience and sympathy. He was performing a work beyond our power, and yet walking the path we have to tread. The cry of

frail dying man in these psalms passed through His heart and lips. He met death in the midst of His days, felt, as truly as we feel, its forebodings and bitterness, "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared." We may say that the struggles of His people in past ages crying for eternal life were breathed into them by Christ's own Spirit, and that then He entered man's world to gather these prayers into His own heart, and secure their answer. The Old Testament is man feeling after God, the New is God finding man, and He who is the Leader in both, who breathes the question into man's heart, and then answers it, is that Eternal Son "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." And, now, the sharer of our dying nature, the sympathiser with its cries, the bearer of its sins, has become the Lord of eternal life. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" Let a man, let any man, come in humble faith and cast on Him the burden of guilt, and he will receive a Divine power from Christ Himself that will make his present life the beginning and the pledge of an everlasting one. Though the beginning be small, the latter end shall greatly increase; and when death comes, the prayer, "O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days," will be changed into, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."

JOHN KER.

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SEMITIC studies are constantly advancing in America. Already there is provision for thorough instruction in the Semitic Languages, especially in Hebrew, at two of the oldest universities in the country—not to speak of one of the youngest and best, Johns Hopkins at Baltimore, where Dr. Paul Haupt, a rising German Assyriologist, is Professor of Semitic Languages. At Harvard University, in connection with the Divinity School, Prof. C. H. Toy has the chair in Hebrew, and Prof. D. G. Lyon devotes especial attention to Assyriology. Recently Yale College has added Prof. W. R. Harper, late of the Chicago Baptist Union Theological Seminary, to its faculty. It is expected that he will do for Semitic studies a work similar to that which Prof. Whitney of that institution has accomplished in Sanscrit. He will not only give instruction in the college, but also in the Yale Divinity School. With his tireless energy and his contagious enthusiasm for these studies, we may hope not only that he will attract the attention of many to them, but also that he may be successful in inaugurating a movement whereby the preparatory work in Hebrew shall be done before the admission of students to the theological seminaries.

Besides his regular work in the seminary during eight months and in connection with the Hebrew Correspondence School, he has been at the head of five Summer Schools of the Institute of Hebrew, each lasting a month, which have been held beginning respectively, June 7th at Philadelphia, June 28th at Morgan Park near Chicago, July 19th at Newton Centre, Mass., August 2nd at Chautauqua, N.Y., and August 16th at the University of Virginia. Dr. Harper has spent from two to three weeks in each place, and has received the co-operation of some of the most eminent Semitic scholars in the country. The object of these schools may be learned substantially from the prospectus of the one at Philadelphia: (1) for those desiring to begin; (2) for those desiring to review; (3) for the study of Hebrew Grammar (Etymology) and Deuteronomy; (4) for study of Hebrew Grammar (Syntax) and Minor Prophets; (5) sections for sight-reading; (6) sections for conversation and pronunciation of unpointed Hebrew; (7) for study of Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, and Assyrian; (8) twenty lectures on linguistic and literary topics. The tuition

fee at each of these schools is £2. By concentration on one thing admirable progress is made even in a month. The schools are useful as tending to establish an *esprit du corps* among the Hebrew professors in America, and afford a valuable opportunity for ministers to review their studies, or even to lay a foundation where they have not studied Hebrew before. At the same time it is hoped that students may be prepared to enter the seminaries with some knowledge of Hebrew.

The Institute of Hebrew, under whose auspices these schools have been established, has made an arrangement for electing as Fellows of the Institute those who shall successfully pass examinations in one half of each of the three grand divisions of the Hebrew Bible (history, prophecy, poetry), including a thorough knowledge of Hebrew Grammar, and two cognate languages, *e.g.* Aramaic and Arabic, or Assyrian and Arabic, and who shall prepare an original thesis on some subject connected with Old Testament Study.

HEBREW GRAMMAR.—Two interesting articles on *The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians*¹ have recently appeared from the prolific pen of Rev. B. Pick, a Christian Jew. *Hebraica* has furnished other contributions of more or less merit. The following are perhaps the most noteworthy: Prof. C. H. Toy, writing on *The Massoretic Vowel System*,² affirms that Shewa was a real vowel sound, and that the language treated it as forming an independent syllable. He holds that it is unnecessary to speak of half open syllables. In the same number³ Prof. Haupt has published an instructive article on *Assyrian Phonology, with Special Reference to Hebrew*. Not to mention other articles, Prof. Briggs has begun a series on Hebrew Poetry,⁴ in which he gives illustrations of the trimeter.

Prof. Harper has recently issued two of his text books in new editions. One is called an *Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual*⁵ ("second edition—re-written"), the other, *Elements of Hebrew by an Inductive Method*⁵ ("sixth edition—re-written"). The Method contains fifty lessons, which are based on the first eight chapters of Genesis. Each verse is taken up and analysed in the most careful manner, *e.g.* in the first lesson, which is based on Gen. i. 1,

¹ See the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1884, pp. 477 ff., and for July, 1885, pp. 470 ff.

² *Hebraica*, Jan., 1885, pp. 137-144.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 175-181.

⁴ *Hebraica*, April, 1886, pp. 164-170.

⁵ Chicago American Publication Society of Hebrew, 1885.

there are (1) Notes, (2) Observations, (3) Word-lesson, (4) Exercises, English and Hebrew, (5) Topics for study. The Manual, which is bound up with the Method, contains (1) The first four chapters of Genesis in the Hebrew text, (2) in a literal translation, (3) in unpointed Hebrew, (4) a transliteration of the first chapter. Besides, there is the text of v.-viii., a Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew vocabulary, and list of 332 words in Hebrew and translation. The grammar exhibits a thorough mastery of the principles of vocalisation set forth by Bickell. It is perhaps easier by the inductive method, which at once introduces the student to the text, to excite and retain the general interest of a class than by any other. The writer, however, who has used Davidson's *Introductory Hebrew Grammar* for seven years, is not yet certain that the results attained by the use of Harper's books are preferable to those secured by the use of Davidson's Grammar.

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.—Attention is called by Prof. H. P. Smith, of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, in two issues of the *Old Testament Student*,¹ to the importance of text-criticism. He maintains that at the best we cannot definitely prove that our Massoretic text extends farther back than the beginning of the first century. Therefore the Septuagint is of the greatest importance in forming a critical text, since we have reason to believe that it was complete about 131 B.C.; he holds, therefore, that "it is older by three centuries than any other source of knowledge concerning the Old Testament text."

PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.—Old Testament scholars of the conservative school have not been idle in repelling the attacks made by the school of Wellhausen. While they all fail in meeting some of the important objections made by the destructive critics to the traditional view of the origin of the Pentateuch, yet they have done an important work in showing the strength of some of the positions which may be taken against the critical theory of the origin of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah (621 B.C.), and of the middle books of the Pentateuch after the return from the exile under Ezra (444 B.C.).

Wellhausen's argument in favour of the post-exilic origin of the middle books of the Pentateuch is a master-piece of logic and

¹ April, 1885, pp. 337-344; May, 1885, pp. 402-488. With this should be compared his more extended Article, *The Old Testament Text and the Revised Version*, in *The Presbyterian Review*, New York, October, 1885, pp. 623-625.

critical investigation. But he has dealt with the Pentateuch about as the new French empire did with the crooked, narrow streets of old Paris. His avenues are broad and direct, but it is very questionable whether they represent the ancient topography.

Prof. W. H. Green of Princeton has produced two books,¹ which exhibit a good understanding of the subject, and are worthy of great praise. He shows that if we regard Moses as a historical personage, and the ten commandments as emanating from him substantially in their present form—and for this he contends—that the critical hypothesis loses a most important support, and that we can hold beyond a peradventure that law preceded prophecy. He shows that the critics in developing their hypothesis as to the middle books of the Pentateuch have carried their arguments concerning the silence of the more primitive Old Testament history and prophecy too far, and so have fallen, in some cases, into reasoning in a circle by ascribing certain passages to later priestly hands, when the question at issue is after all as to the age of these documents. He argues forcibly that the Jehovistic legislation in the classic passage (Exod. xx. 24) indicates but one place of worship at a time, not contemporaneous places, and in this respect agrees with the teaching in Deuteronomy and the Priests' Code. His answer to Knenen, however, in *Moses and the Prophets*, is the least satisfactory part of that book.

Prof. Bissell's work² exhibits great industry, and is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. He is often dogmatic and perhaps uses more similes than are necessary in a discussion where a wise compression is a virtue. He hardly gives a fair impression as to the real strength of the new critical school in Germany with regard to the number and character of its adherents. But the book is a useful and honest endeavour to present arguments in favour of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Like Prof. Green, he shows clearly and forcibly how incredible it is that a man writing in the time of Josiah should embody such commands and statements as the author of Deuteronomy has done. Indeed these arguments against a late authorship seem more powerful than those which the critics urge in favour of it. Or was the author of Deuteronomy such an antiquarian that he could

¹ *Moses and the Prophets*, New York, 1883; *The Hebrew Feasts*, New York, 1885.

² *The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure. An Examination of Recent Theories*, by Edward Cone Bissell, D.D., New York, 1885.

simulate all these marks of an earlier age? We know of no parallel example in Old Testament literature. Prof. Bissell, after an introductory chapter, gives a historical sketch of the criticism, tests the proposed analysis of the law, considers laws peculiar to Deuteronomy, repeated and modified in Deuteronomy, laws peculiar to the Priests' Code, and the genuineness of Deuteronomy. He then discusses the Law in relation to the Prophets, the Historical Books, and the Psalms, and appends a very complete table of the literature of the Pentateuch and the related criticism of the Old Testament, besides full indexes. Without design, this book clearly exhibits the existence of three parallel codes in its efforts to harmonize them.

The latest work on Pentateuch criticism is by a Fellow of Princeton Theological Seminary, Geerhardus Vos, of Huguenot descent, although born in Holland. It bears the marks of Dutch thoroughness as well as of our American tendency to undertake many things. No scholar occupying a similar position in Germany would attempt to write anything more than a monograph, but here is a work on the *Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal Codes*,¹ in twenty-one chapters, which discusses almost every phase of the subject with admirable terseness and clearness. It must be admitted, however, that some of the subjects are necessarily treated in an incomplete and superficial way. The most serious criticism which can be made on the book is its lack of foot-notes and indexes. Such an omission of references is unfair to the conscientious critic who wishes to verify the accuracy of the statements, as well as to the student who should have access to the authorities used by the writer. The tone of the book is in some places unpleasant. There is here and there an imputation of motives which should for ever be banished from such works. His use of the word "pretended" in connexion with evidence, etc., adduced by critics, occurring several times, is an illustration of the catch-words that some suppose they find in the so-called Elohistie or Jehovistic documents. The second chapter, on the *History of the Linguistic Argument of the Critics*, which is based on a dissertation by König, not only gives two dates that are wrong by a year, but the author unwittingly conveys an erroneous impression as to the position of Ewald with reference to this argument. He does not seem to know that Ewald withdrew the view² which he at-

¹ New York, 1886. ² *Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1831, pp. 596, 597.

tributes to him, and that he speaks depreciatingly of the book in which it is found as the work of one who was only nineteen years old.

He is the only one of the American critics named who examines the linguistic argument. He fails to show satisfactorily, however, how certain expressions are characteristic of the Elohim-passages, while synonymous expressions are found in Jehovah-passages. But aside from these strictures, the book is to be commended as a valuable compendium of arguments from a conservative standpoint for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

OLD TESTAMENT REVISION.—There has been a spirited discussion in some of the Reviews and religious papers regarding the merits of the revision. The occasion was a severe criticism¹ which was made by Prof. Briggs on the entire work, with especial reference to the shortcomings of the American Revisers. Whatever the merits of the discussion may be, there was developed on the part of Prof. Briggs, especially in the religious journals, a partizanship and an assumption of superior scholarship that detracted from the effect of his criticisms, which betray a thorough understanding of the subject. These criticisms are fourfold: the revisers are open to the charge, (1) of not having formed a critical text, or at least of not having used the critical apparatus at hand; (2) of clinging to an antiquated grammar; (3) of failing to indicate the true character of the poetry, by a blind adherence to the Massoretic system; (4) of often missing the true theological terminology in the Old Testament.

The ground taken by Prof. Briggs in regard to the text was, that an eclectic text must be formed through a comparison of the Hebrew with the chief versions. He did not seem to reflect, that however desirable such a work might be, the Old Testament revision could not have been attempted at all until Old Testament text-criticism had passed through a course similar to that of the New. Indeed, the revisers could not well have engaged in the formation of a critical text unless they had been willing to postpone the revision indefinitely, and hand it down for a more modern and better trained generation of scholars,² of which Prof. Briggs is himself a representative. The importance and nature of such

¹ *Presbyterian Review*, New York, 1885, pp. 486-533.

² Compare my treatment of this subject in *Current Discussions in Theology*, Chicago, 1885, vol. iii, pp. 18ff. and 66; and in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for July.

textual criticism is also ably set forth by Prof. H. P. Smith of Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati. The charge regarding too great conservatism in following the principles of modern Hebrew grammar was made with more reason, although it seems that such grammarians as Davidson, Driver, and Cheyne, were unable to overcome it, and it must be remembered that conservatism rather than radicalism is demanded in such a work. With regard to the third criticism, it remains for Prof. Briggs to write a work on Hebrew poetry which shall secure the general acceptance of Hebrew scholars before we can blame the revisers very sharply for following Massoretic tradition.¹ Indeed the sum of the criticism can only be, the time was not ripe for an Old Testament revision. Neither the scholarship nor the Church were ripe for it. Only time can prove whether this judgment was just. In any case the discussions of this subject will be of great value in the impulse which they will give to Old Testament scholarship, for which Prof. Briggs is doing so much in America.

MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.—*The Blood Covenant*,² by H. Clay Trumbull, D.D., author of *Kadesh Barnea* and editor of the *Sunday School Times*, is a marked book. The author seems to prove beyond a doubt that the blood covenant is one of the most ancient and universal institutions. This idea is founded on the representation familiar to Old Testament scholars, that the blood stands for the life. Those who enter into the blood covenant, pledge their life-blood in each other's defence, and form a more solemn bond than any which can be established by marriage or the closest natural relationships. Dr. Trumbull shows that substitute blood was the basis of inter-union between God and man, and that the shedding of blood, not the death of the victim, was the important element in sacrifice.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

BREVIA.

The late Rev. Dr. John Ker.—The bright ornament of the Scottish Church who has passed away, may be briefly commemorated in this Magazine, not merely because he was much interested in it and purposed to contribute, though his feeble health prevented him doing more than allow us to use two discourses, the

¹ He has made a beginning in his *Biblical Study*, and has promised, as remarked above, to prepare a series of articles on the subject for *Hebraica*.

² New York, 1885.

first of which, "The Better Resurrection," was published in March, 1885, while the second appears in this number. Few men have done as he did a work which is as great as that of the laborious exegete—namely, taking the dry material and putting it in a fresh and living form before men. It was this Dean Alford referred to when he said that in Dr. Ker's "Sermons" there was "the uniform shining of the wrought metal." This volume was solitary and unique. It was solitary, for he would not be persuaded to write another. No man ever troubled less about production; he believed that a life which left no definite or concrete memorial might be not less beautiful before God nor less truly enduring among men, than one which bequeathed many volumes. It was unique, for it was the product of a richly gifted and strangely trained nature. For long years he endured an altogether singular discipline of suffering—of the mind as well as of the body—and it was evident to all who heard him that he had the insight granted to those who have eaten their bread in tears. He was free of those regions in which the most laborious calculation can never stand for sight. Then his long journeys in search of health gave him a knowledge of men and countries as well as of books. In Paris he listened to Ernest Renan, and could measure him with a discernment as subtle as his own, while the cordial simplicity of his bearing, his wonderful gifts of conversation, and his frank interest in everything human unlocked to him the hearts of the humblest. As a preacher he was for long heard rarely; but in the judgment of many he had neither equal nor second in the Scotland of his time. His soft accents and subdued manner suited well an oratory of which melancholy was the dominant note and the effect of which was penetrating and moving almost beyond example. The students of the United Presbyterian Theological Hall, whom he instructed for the last few years, were indeed privileged, and it is to be hoped that those who sat with admiration at his feet have gathered and preserved some of the pearls and rubies that dropped from their master's lips. Few knew the difficulties of faith better than he; but his sympathies remained earnestly with those who love and defend the truths in virtue of which Christianity alone of all religions may claim to have fairly measured itself with sin. The loyalty which is characteristic of all noble natures was strong in him, and manifested itself specially in his intense affection for that branch of the Church where he first heard and obeyed the gospel and where he prayed and preached in his youth. His later

years were shadowed by the loss of old comrades, and notwithstanding his cheerfulness, one might often see that "his eyes were with his heart and that was far away." Sorely as he will be missed, it is with brightness as well as sadness that one thinks of the release of his finely touched spirit from the frail body that was so long its troublous framework.

EDITOR.

Notes and News.—Dr. Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*, which are announced for publication by the Clarendon Press, consist of the lectures delivered by him as Grinfield Lecturer at Oxford, 1880-4, revised and partly rewritten. The first part of the work, *i.e.* the first three essays, is philological. The first essay is a detailed examination of the precise value of the Septuagint in regard to the philology of the New Testament, and an endeavour to establish some canons for its use. The second essay is chiefly an application of the principles laid down in the first essay to some New Testament words, the instances having been selected mainly to show the methods of using the Septuagint; but it is also intended to indicate to Biblical students the variety of the sources which still remain to be explored, *e.g.* Egyptian papyri and inscriptions. The third essay is an examination of some of the psychological terms of Biblical Greek, and an enquiry how far Philo throws light upon them. The second part of the work is mainly critical. Two essays are devoted, the one to the text of Ecclesiasticus, and the other to an account of the early Latin versions: but the more important contribution which the work makes to Biblical criticism is an examination of quotations from the Septuagint in writers of the first two centuries, especially in Philo. It is thought that those quotations supply, so far as they go, a criterion for determining the value of MSS., and that the establishment of such a criterion will be valuable in relation not only to the LXX., but also to the New Testament. In any case it will be impossible for New Testament critics to overlook in future the fact that quotations which are earlier by several centuries than any existing MS. frequently agree with late cursives as against the greater uncials. The examination of some passages points to the existence of "revised versions" of the Greek translation, which we do not now possess: and also to the existence of centos, or compilations from several sources for the purposes either of devotion or of controversy.

JOSEPH'S FORGETTING.

THE narrative has followed Joseph through thirteen years of trial and anxiety. Now we find him in a position of much power, splendour, and prosperity. He was at the head of a nation which was perhaps the greatest, and no doubt the most civilized then existing. And king and people alike owned Joseph to be not only wise and trustworthy, but commended by Divine approval—"a man in whom the spirit of God is."

In this position he could not, indeed, be exempt from the cares that wait on greatness. His life must have been busy, and his burdens heavy. The prospect of carrying the nation through the coming years of famine could not be lightly regarded. Moreover, amid all the cares inevitably attendant on his task, there could not fail to be experiences of a more irritating and wearing kind: I mean the difficulties and annoyances introduced by human perversity—by the prejudices and the failings, by the sluggishness, the selfishness, the narrowness, and the jealousies which always withstand the execution of comprehensive plans. His position might be too strong to be seriously attacked—especially when each year's abundance confirmed his prediction of seven years' plenty, and gave weight to the warning as to coming years of famine. His fidelity and wisdom might authenticate his claims afresh, with each fresh experience of them. And in the new position, as in those he filled before, God might give him favour in the eyes of those with whom he had to do. Yet who could occupy for years together the highest station under an Oriental monarchy

without finding that courts are the native home of envy and intrigue, that jealous eyes watched for his halting, and that swift and subtle tongues were ever ready to misrepresent and to defame him? It proved to be so in the case of Daniel, it could hardly fail to be so in the case of Joseph.

But none of these things are mentioned. If they existed they did not prevail so as to give character to the period of Joseph's history now before us. If they existed, they did not take a very important place. God kept His servant in power, as He had kept him in weakness and depression; Joseph was still a prosperous man, and the Lord was with him. We need not doubt that he was enabled to rest the cares of the present and the solitudes of the future in God.—God, who had given him hitherto all the wisdom he needed—God, who had never failed to care for him when wisdom of his own could do little for him. We may reasonably think so; for this period of Joseph's life is represented to us as a happy one. Happy it was, because the Lord was with him; and also because the Lord gave him rest, and surrounded him with the elements of a bright and prosperous life.

True, there is not in this world any absolute or unmixed happiness, nor is anything earthly in itself able to bestow that boon. But many things can minister to comfort and enjoyment, some of which may give rise to pleasure of a very pure and elevated kind. These naturally desirable things, which promote the enjoyment of life, are not to be rated too high; but it is a mistake, or a hypocrisy, to assign to them no importance at all. And Joseph felt, no doubt, the gladness imparted by the sunshine of a prosperous life, just as he had felt, though he had nobly sustained the depressing influence of slavery, of wrong, of imprisonment. Deliverance from these, with the honour, power, and wealth that came in their room, certainly ministered to his happiness. But in his case the grand security for his happiness,

the foundation of it, was that favour of the Lord which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow. That had been with him all along, and was with him still. It not only formed the security of his happiness, but imparted to that happiness its peculiar character. Surely the tenor of Joseph's life warrants us to believe that the sense of divine kindness in all outward benefits, the assurance that they came from the hand and heart of that God who had been his trust in all his afflictions, gave to Joseph's prosperity a special charm, a peculiar power to make his heart glad.

In contemplating the prosperous years of Joseph's life we not only are to think of what I may call its more vulgar elements, such as rank, honour and riches. Much more weight than can belong to these must be attached to the field of exercise now opened for the capacities with which God had endowed him. Undoubtedly one of the highest pleasures of men of great capacity is found in the management of great affairs. It is found in the forthputting of all their energy and all their wisdom on some noble work, which tries all their resources, and at the same time rewards all their toil. To such work Joseph was called—administering for many years the affairs of Egypt, and having it for his task so to develop and apply the resources of the land as to carry the people through a great crisis. The qualities which enabled Joseph to accomplish this with success were, no doubt, the natural and acquired endowments of his character, under that guidance from God which every believer may expect. His call to the work had something supernatural in it; but nothing is said to lead us to suppose that in discharging his task he wielded any supernatural endowment. Prayerfully and diligently he used the faculties he possessed. They must have been of a very high order. And in the use of them—in framing and executing his plans, in watching and guiding the progress of far-reaching designs, in helming a great people through years

of intoxicating plenty and crushing want, in seeing his work grow under his hand until the danger had passed and Egypt was saved—no doubt Joseph experienced all the pleasure which great leaders are wont to enjoy when they subject the rough and stubborn current of affairs to the rhythm of their thought, and cause the secret workings of their own minds to become, under God, a prophecy of the destinies of men.

Now those capacities which proved equal to Joseph's task had been concealed and confined during all his earlier life in Egypt; they had been held in bondage to wrong and to wrongful men; they had been kept in contact with mean and petty cares. So then, when, from this period of Joseph's glory, we go back to the time of his oppression, we are taught a lesson of great moment. The powers that were so faithfully applied to the current duties of his master's house, and to the monotonous occupation of the slow days of imprisonment, were the same which proved adequate afterwards to the government of Egypt. Yet we hear of no murmuring on Joseph's part, no fastidious contempt for those lowly offices. They were discharged faithfully, diligently, kindly. And no doubt in the self-control and the readiness to obey, thus practised, was found the best preparation for coming to reign. The lesson is significant for those to whom it seems that their lot condemns them to a round of duties not worthy of their powers. Nor let the lesson be mistaken so as to lead them to say, "I accept these tasks for the present, on the understanding that by and by I shall be advanced to some nobler office." There shall be no such understanding. Set yourself to present duty as to the work of your life. God has no need of you, and He alone shall judge what in your case shall be reckoned fit and worthy employment.

We have reckoned this among the elements of Joseph's happy and prosperous state, that a great work was set for

him to do, giving full scope for all his faculties. But one thing must be added. His welfare was enhanced by the special nature of that work. It was not like so many efforts of statesmanship, merely selfish or ambitious; it was a work of beneficence; he was sent to save life and to preserve with a great deliverance. Kindliness and fidelity had marked his conduct in all the positions in which successively he had been placed; and now also he was to labour not for himself but for others. As his thoughts and his anxieties took hold of the case of those entrusted to him—the great people throughout all their communities and families; as he warmed to the work of setting them in safety; as he toiled and journeyed, as he planned and superintended, doubtless God gave him to taste the luxury of doing good, the pleasure of toiling for unselfish ends, of spending and being spent to make others happy.

This was his work. Thus God not only made his happiness to be pure, moral and godlike, but did much to secure him against the selfish isolation which is the besetting danger of high station. And thus Joseph's education for eternity was as truly and effectually carried on amid his glory and his wealth, as in the days when sorrow and bondage were moulding his spirit and exercising his faith. Thus also he was conformed the more to the likeness of our blessed Lord, of whom he became a more eminent and perfect type. For surely when we see this Son of Promise watchfully providing bread for the people of the land of his affliction, we cannot but think of Him who came into the world to give us bread, indeed, but better bread; not gathered from our soil, but such as came down from heaven; the true bread, the living bread—even His flesh, which He gave for the life of the world.

Placed in such circumstances, we find Joseph giving expression to his feelings when his sons were born. One he called Manasseh, Forgetting: "For," said he, "God hath

made me forget all my toil and all my father's house ; " and the second Ephraim, saying, " God hath made me fruitful in the land of my affliction."

" God hath made me forget all my toil." The prosperous years were doing their office in Joseph's life. They were making changes in the man. They were working off the depression, the anxiety, the wistfulness of that sorrowful past ; they were filling his soul with more ample conceptions of God's goodness ; they were causing him to forget all his toil.

As the houses of living men are often raised on the unsuspected remains of those of forgotten generations, so the scenes of our life, as they succeed one another, rest upon, and as it were bury and replace those that went before. The facts may be remembered, but the impressions are replaced by the living impressions of later years and of to-day. But sometimes, in old towns, a stroke of a pickaxe brings men unexpectedly into a chamber, or into a temple, under the foundations of their house, which they had never suspected to be there—a chamber that was the scene of life and work in days long gone by ; and there may still be traced, by the dim light, the painting and the carving, once rich in associations, and the arrangements that bring back the manner of life which men used of old. Just so when some event sets us unawares in an unwonted mood of thought, striking a note that brings old recollections, like a strain of forgotten music, through the mind, then our past rises up for us again. It rises, not in bare recollection of facts and dates, but re-embodied ; with something of the old spirit, the old environment, the old impression, if also with something of a twilight faintness. Then, standing for a little in our past again, reimpresed for some precarious moments with its old impressions, aware again how its views and interests once seized and chained us, we become conscious of the change which time and life have made. We realise how our life is

mixed of remembering and forgetting ; the present resting on the past indeed, but on a sunken and faded past.

Joseph's toil, in which God had trained and tried him, had been long and hard. Though, as a man of faith, he did not sink under it, yet, as a man of faith, he would not fail to realise its full significance. It is not the manner of such a man to bear trial with dull resignation, but rather to face, and measure, and watch the trial, wrestling with its temptations, looking out for God's grace, and hearkening for His voice. And so Joseph may well have felt, for many in like case have felt, as though the years of depression and sorrow had fixed their mark upon the soul too deep to be ever effaced. As he found year coming after year, day slowly following upon day, wave coming after wave, he might think that the springs of life must always show the effect of the pressure laid upon them so early and so long. He might feel as though, through all his future fortunes, there could never leave him the consciousness and impression of that dark sky, of those long conflicts of faith, of that bowing of the shoulders to bear, and of the heart to be patient.

But Joseph was in a new world now. God had brought forth his righteousness as the light, his judgment as the noonday. He had brought him to honour as His own servant and special friend ; had given Egypt into his hand, therein to do great works, glorious to God and merciful to men ; had compassed him with all good gifts, and still was near him to guide and keep him. Amid the scenes of this new, busy, animated life, amid its comforts and its hopeful activities, its thankfulness and its zealous service, there could be little time to mark how much of change passed on the moods and impressions of the man. Each day did its work, burying the past with the gathering strata of the present, until the very completeness of that present made irresistibly vivid the contrast in which it stood with the

past. So one day, when his cup ran over in the joy of his first son's birth, and his heart filled with the thought how God was building up his house for him, suddenly the weary struggling past rose up before him with its depressions and its fears. How completely, how swiftly it had passed away ! What a dead and buried past it seemed. How thoroughly he was *out* of it, so that the remembrance came strange to him, as of another world, of another life. And Joseph's heart was glad, as he called his son's name Forgetting, for God had made him forget all his toil. "Thou turnest the shadow of death into the morning."

Thus God made him forget ; for it was no ungrateful forgetting of the greatness of the deliverance, nor of the mercies of the years of conflict, as some have strangely supposed. And if the toil was in this sense forgotten, yet was it not lost. The results of it were all present and operative. No faith, no patience which it had been given to him to evince, were lost. Though the vivid impressions of that older day must needs be vanishing, the growth of the soul, the exercise and moulding of the man, which those trials had effected, remained, fitting him for the due use of honours and enjoyments. The ploughing and harrowing of the brown soil in spring are not counted to be lost when summer sees the land triumphant with such wealth of corn that the earth can no more be anywhere seen. So the life of Joseph's soul in its exaltation was prepared and had its strength from the trials of his day of toil.

And so we must remark that the main thing now about that past was, How it had been used. For it was gone now, wholly gone, except as the use of it had left results behind. It was because Joseph had been enabled to use it well, that it had left for him a capacity of joining, to a large extent, enjoyment with usefulness and growth. But for that, they had left him, most likely, with a soured and broken temper, with pride exasperated as much as it had been

mortified. I do not deny that trials have their present pathetic importance for flesh and blood ; but I say that the main question about them is revealed afterwards. When they are all gone ; when the past to which they belonged rises before us like a picture, at once old and new in strange contrast, then the question is, How have we dealt with them and used them ? What have they left behind ?

“ All my toil, *and all my father's house.*” For in those times of sorrow, had not this been the cherished employment of the captive's mind, to recall his father's house ? To keep fresh and clear every remembered scene ; to reimprint the fading outlines and freshen the colours in his memory ; to dwell on every dear remembrance of his home ? Had not this been the object of many a longing, the burden of many a wistful conjecture, how to get back, how he might come again in peace to that father's house ? We may be sure that all his dreams of well-being and deliverance took shape, found the manner of their clothing in images drawn from that one source ; and often it had been hard to forbear dwelling on them rebelliously. But now God had made him feel that the career of deliverance and comfort might, did, take another shape. He filled the present for him with other scenes, and the future with other expectations ; and He enriched all with a great sense of enjoyment, of peace and welfare, given and blessed by God. Now, therefore, his father's house, loved as it still must be, could not rise in his mind as the sole form of welfare, the sole image of good, nor could his expectations of home happiness take that form now. That too had gone from the present to the past. God had in this wise made him forget, even all his father's house.

Doubtless it shall be even so in that strangely glorious state which awaits the redeemed of God. It is not that oblivion shall swallow up the past, or that there shall be no power to recall the varied and chequered scenery of mortal

life. What is so much to us now, so interesting and important, surely shall not have become mere nothing to us then. But how altered shall be the setting and the surroundings of the vision, how new the point of view, in what a changed light shall it be seen! From what another land shall we look back on the conflicts with temptation and weariness and burdens! With what a sense of rest, of security, of victory, of power! Ah, and even on that which endeared life most to us, what we clung to, what we were most loath to let go or most yearned to attain, what most eminently seemed to surround us here with the plenty and the love of a father's house! That was good, very good, so far as God gave it and blessed it. But what shall be the peace and fulness of the time when the soul's own inheritance is come, and the heart is full at last of the present love of God. The temptation and the toil, how completely passed away! The earthly good, how superseded and replaced by the richer fruit of a better country! This shall be one of the sayings of heaven: God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house. But it is a Joseph that says it. Fidelity and faith led him by the way, till he reached the point where such sayings came fitly from his mind and lips.

Finally, whatever might be the sense in which God made Joseph to forget, it was not in such a sense as cut the links between him and the past, nor such as should disable him from taking the tenderest concern in the welfare of his father's house. In due time this appeared. And so there is one clothed with honour in the Father's house on high, who is gone from prison and from judgment to a throne of glory. He dieth no more. For Him all suffering is gone away into the past, and with Him evermore is His own holy and perfect peace. Yet this does not disable Him from fellowship with our want and sorrow. He is *touched* with the feeling of our infirmity. And in that He hath *suffered*

being tempted, He is able also to succour them that are tempted.

ROBERT RAINY.

THE WESTCOTT-HORT "GENEALOGICAL
METHOD."¹

THE connexion of the Revised Version of the New Testament with the Greek text of Canon Westcott and Professor Hort may be said to be organic, whilst that text finds its scientific basis in the "method" on which I here venture a few criticisms. With the merits of the Revised Version itself I am not now concerned; nor, save as embodying in a concrete form the theory of the "method" aforesaid, and therefore furnishing its fullest illustration, with the Greek text which these distinguished scholars have edited. It may be useful, however, to extend my remarks to a few other collateral portions of the "Introduction" to that text; since there that method is propounded. Whilst the world has been torn with contention as to the "version" which is indirectly connected with the "method," I have seen no attempt to analyse and test the method itself.

But, although the even indirect connexion thus existing between the revision and the method has given the latter its greatest interest, as it has furnished its most important application, the method asserts its perfectly general scope as regards families of MSS. wherever they exist.

On this behalf, indeed, Professor Hort claims (Introduction, p. 73, Part III. § 96) that his—

"Principles of criticism hold good for all ancient texts preserved in a plurality of documents. In dealing with the text of the New Testament no new principle is needed or legitimate; but no other ancient

¹ *The Introduction and Appendix to the Westcott Hort edition of the New Testament.* Cambridge and London: Macmillan & Co.

text admits of so full and extensive application of all the means of discriminating original from erroneous readings. . . . On the one hand the New Testament, as compared with the rest of ancient literature, needs peculiarly vigilant and patient handling, on account of the intricacy of evidence due to the unexampled amount and antiquity of mixture of different texts, from which few even of the better documents are free. On the other it has unique advantages in the abundance, the antiquity, and above all in the variety of documentary evidence, a *characteristic specially favourable to the tracing of genealogical order.*"

I italicize the last clause as showing the perfectly genuine way in which the theory grew out of the work of settling the text. So the work of adjusting and settling their alluvial plots in the Nile valley is said to have led the Egyptians to evolve the theory of geometry.

Families of MSS., then, exist in far greater copiousness and complication of textual conditions for the New Testament than for any other collection of ancient writings;¹ while the momentous issue of the investigation of these MSS. in the spiritual interests of humanity, adds to a theory first excogitated in relation to these an importance which it is not easy to exaggerate. I have therefore, both five years ago, when the theory fully formulated first appeared, and again lately, gone over carefully each step of the testing process which I now submit, and endeavoured to find, if possible, any flaw in it. This was indeed due to the high personal and literary character of the authors of the theory, as well as to the claims of truth, and to the sacred material in which the theory first found its application.

The literary style in which the theory is clothed is not one of the most lucid. Complicated phenomena, subtle distinctions, and intricate reasonings in which abstract terms

¹ Take for instance the perhaps most widely diffused and multiplied of any ancient Greek classic, the Homeric poems. There appear to exist of the *Iliad* alone 101 MSS., of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* together 10, of the *Odyssey* alone 36, total 147. These include fragments and MSS. of sections only of either work. Of the New Testament the cursive MSS. alone are put by Dean Alford at over 900. See La Roche, *Homerische Textkritik*, pp. 439 foll.

take unavoidably the place of the actual *Thatsachen* which filled the author's mind as he wrote, all require a highly perspicuous presentment to make them intelligible. The abstruse forms into which the subject is necessarily cast might, I think, have benefited by a more transparent vesture of expression than they have mostly found. Sometimes it seems as if an attempt to attain greater clearness only resulted in cloudiness. Take the following as an instance, from p. 47.

"Wherever we find a considerable number of variations, in which two or more arrays of documents attesting the two or more variants are identical, we know that at least a considerable amount of the texts of the documents constituting each array must be descended from a common ancestor subsequent to the single universal original, *the limitation of ancestry being fixed by the dissent of the other array or arrays.* Each larger array may often in like manner be broken up into subordinate arrays, each of which separately is found repeatedly supporting a number of readings rejected by the other documents; and each such separate smaller array must have its own special ancestry. If the text is free from mixture, the larger arrays disclose the earlier divergences of transmission, the smaller arrays the later divergences; *in other words, wherever transmission has been independent, the immediate relations of existing documents are exhibited by those variations which isolate the most subordinate combinations of documents, the relationships of the ultimate ancestors of existing documents by those variations in which the combinations of documents are the most comprehensive; not necessarily the most numerous individually, but the most composite.*

If the portions here italicized in the above had been left out, the general idea conveyed would have been clearer. Let any reader try by skipping them.

Occasional ambiguities of terms or of construction not seldom throw a cloud over the sense. Thus the word "variations" should carry a single definite meaning throughout; but, if it did, no sense could be made of some of the passages where it occurs. In the passage cited above it seems to mean passages in which various readings are found. In a passage on p. 109, § 154, in which the "in-

structiveness of the variations" of the Pauline Epistles is noticed, it seems to bear its ordinary meaning of "various readings." But when we turn the page, we find in § 155, "the *variations* here mentioned between different parts of the New Testament are, it will be noticed, of two kinds." How the "various readings" could be thus simply classified as "of *two* kinds," is a startling question; but the context shows that no such thing is meant; but rather the various degrees in which certain types of text called "the Western," and "the Alexandrian," are found to prevail in different parts of the New Testament. So with regard to the word "distribution." We read on p. 104, § 146, "The distribution of documents is fairly typical," and see at once that their grouping in support of this or that reading of a passage quoted just before is meant. But on p. 109, § 154, "In the Catholic Epistles the Western Text is much obscured by . . . the limited *distribution* of some of the books in early times." Here what we mostly call "circulation" seems meant. On p. 132, § 184, "The most instructive *distributions*, as exhibiting distinctly the residual Pre-Syrian text, which is neither Western nor Alexandrian," seems again most easy to grasp as "groupings of MSS." in support of readings neither Western nor Alexandrian. On p. 198, § 270, we have the "*distribution* of Western and non-Western texts among versions" spoken of, where "the degrees in which such texts are *constituents* of the various versions," seems intended. As regards construction, take p. 40, § 49 (end). "The principle . . . is still too imperfectly understood to need no explanation"; where what is meant is, "The principle is still so imperfectly understood that it needs explanation." Again, what is to be made of the following? I will explain presently why I put the first word in brackets:—

"[Except] where some one particular corruption was so obvious and tempting that an unusual number of scribes might fall into it

independently, a few documents are not, by reason of their mere paucity, appreciably less likely to be right than a multitude opposed to them."

Now I submit with all deference that *without* the "except" this makes sense, but *with it*, nonsense. A particular corruption is what critics call a *proclive vitium*: scribe after scribe goes down the slope and into the hole. A few avoid the treacherous incline. The few are right and the many wrong. *Therefore* whenever any error is thus "obvious and tempting," the few who avoid are not less likely to be right than the many who accept; or, to put it more distinctly, the many who accept are less likely to be right than the few who avoid such error. The facility of error is the condition which includes the result; but by writing "except" it is made the condition which *excludes* it. The writer has admitted "mixture" among the negative clauses here floating in his mind. Just as when,

". . . Alderman Curtis told Alderman Brown,
"It seemed as if wonders had never *done ceasing*."

We shall see further that this "mixture" re-appears as a feature of the mental process.

Since logic was in its swaddling clothes, dichotomy has been among its simplest and oldest formulas. On p. 113, § 159, we find the writer dwelling, as on a most "striking phenomenon," on "the number of places in which the quotations exhibit *at least two* series of readings, Western and *what may be called* Non-Western." You might at first reading this suppose that you had stumbled on a misprint for "North-Western," but it appears again and again. What then? Is dichotomy intended? The words which I italicize show that nothing so simple and superficial was in the writer's mind. He does *not* mean to tell us as a "most striking phenomenon" that *all* readings may be classed as either "Western" or "Non-Western," which

would be like proclaiming, "In the name of the Prophet—figs!" As we look backward and forward we find other classes, to wit "Alexandrian" and "Syrian," claiming their places. If you should urge that these are equally "Non-Western" with *the* Non-Western, you would be trifling with a profound entity, which is transcendently "Non-Western"—in short is negative, and otherwise indescribable, perhaps unfathomable. When men write to be understood, they generally keep their nomenclature free from such conundrums as this.


But these are only surface-flaws, however they may spoil that luminousness which is the charm of style. Let us now look a little deeper into the grain and texture of the block. The nucleus of the whole theory goes in effect into a very small compass, being contained between p. 40 and p. 57, and from this I will therefore make a few pertinent extracts. Let me premise that *a* genealogy all MSS. necessarily have, and that to get at the laws which underlie it, by a true method, is ever the root of the whole matter. The only question now raised is whether the method stated is the true key.

On p. 43, § 54, after supposing in § 52 nine MSS. which have one original and a tenth independent, which has of course a distinct original, and showing that by introducing the factor of genealogy "the nine sink jointly to a numerical authority not greater than that of the one," the argument proceeds without taking any account of the genealogical source of the independent tenth MS. Let us exhibit the case symbolically as follows :



These *two* parent MSS. are shown, B and C, each with its offspring; but the nine of B all survive, while of C one only, *a*, survives. B and C also perish. The flaw here

appears to me to be the failure to notice that, since the object is to work back through B and C to some higher link, the attesting value of the nine surviving MSS. derived from B must be ninefold that of the attesting value of the *one* surviving from C. That is, the chances of ascribing to C merely adventitious errors are as nine to one compared with B. As far as facts show, "mixture" may predominate in *a* and blemish the virtues of ancestry, whatever they may be. This tabulation is mine, introduced to clear the subject merely. The next is the writer's own, and it is most important, for it seems to exhibit the key to his "genealogical method." It is, I believe, the only one in the volume, and is on p. 54, § 68. I could wish he had been less sparing of such illustrative machinery. It tends to keep the thread of expression clear, and by so doing to prevent entanglement of thought. For lack of this, I am free to confess that I may have sometimes failed to grasp the writer's meaning. But I think I have shown in the foregoing some slender presumption that, if this be so, it is not wholly the fault of the critic.



The lowest line of fourteen letters represents as many extant MSS. of the same literary work in five groups, each containing a variable number of copies. They are derived through links represented by *a β γ δ ε* in the line next above, and these again through X and Y from the common ancestor O of all; and all the links between O and *a b c*, etc., together with O itself, are supposed to have perished. We

are further to "suppose also that no cross-distributions implying mutual or internal mixture can be detected." We are then told that "the proportion of 9 to 5" (that of X's descendants to those of Y) "tells us nothing." But surely it gives us the larger array of evidence for expelling adventitious error, and therefore for confirming the residuum of truth; and this, where *all* the links of descent are supposed lost and retracable only by inference, seems no unimportant fact. Let this pass, however. Of course X and Y are opposed in certain readings, and represent O so far only as they agree. Similarly the groups under X are opposed to those under Y. But the case is then supposed—

"Where the descendants of either X or Y are divided, so that the representatives of (say) γ join those of δ and ϵ against those of α and β , and the question arises whether the reading of X is truly represented by $\alpha\beta$ or by γ , the decision must be given for that of γ , because mixture and accidental coincidence apart, in no other way can γ have become at once separated from $\alpha\beta$ and joined to $\delta\epsilon$; in other words, the change must have been not on the part of γ but of $\alpha\beta$, or rather an intermediate common ancestor of theirs."

Observe here that "mixture and accidental coincidence" are supposed to be shut out; and must we not also therefore say "accidental *divergency*"? since there can be no presumption in favour of excluding one of these without a corresponding presumption in favour of the other being excluded. But how, save by some influence, thus excluded, an "intermediate common ancestor" can have gone astray, is not clear, and is not suggested in the text. Assuming, however, that $\alpha\beta$ or their "intermediate" may have gone astray from representing X, then may just as probably $\delta\epsilon$ have gone astray, or their "intermediate," from representing Y. There is no element of likelihood on the one side which is not present on the other, and the new position of γ , so far from settling the question, "by which group is X now represented?" is in fact the phenomenon which raises

it. Further, X and Y have a common element by which they represent O, and which they transmit in various degrees to their posterity, and in respect of this common element all the ultimate descendants show resemblances and agree so far already; therefore the novel agreement of γ with δ and ϵ cannot represent any part of this element. If then $\gamma \delta \epsilon$ are found grouped against $\alpha \beta$, the grouping is merely split between β and γ , instead of between γ and δ as before. But wherever it is split, the corresponding adverse groups, whether now larger or smaller, must represent the same elements as before, *viz.* those in respect of which X and Y *differ*. And, it may be added, if $\delta \epsilon$ still represent Y as against X, which the text leads us to suppose them to do, then γ by joining them cannot represent X as against Y, as Professor Hort in the above extract decides it to do.

But yet further, the assumption which excludes "mixture and external coincidence" appears to be unduly made. For, be it remembered, all primaries and intermediates in the genealogy are lost alike and only knowable so far as their descendants $a b c . . . o$ represent them. The phenomena of $a b c . . . o$ are our sole data, and no presumption as regards any special feature of any lost link can be stronger (although this obviously understates the argument) than a presumption arising from those phenomena. If therefore the novel combination $\gamma \delta \epsilon$, or rather, strictly, $g h i k l m n o$, (for $\gamma \delta \epsilon$ are lost), suggests the presence of such a disturbing agency as "mixture," etc., then that suggestion will balance or outweigh any imagined warranty for assuming such agency excluded.

It seems then to me that Professor Hort, by slipping in an assumption here and arbitrarily ruling a "decision" there, in effect forges links for his theory which ought to be found in the facts, but are not. And this leads me to fear that there is a loose stone in the very foundation of his

structure, which is built upon throughout as if it were firm. I distrust not "genealogical method" as a principle, but the particular one which he has formulated, which is a permanent and continuous factor in his entire system, and with the insecurity of which, confidence in the entire system is shaken. He is very thorough and persistent in his application, and seems to find in the same "method" a key to the distribution of the "Western" and other texts, as well as to the discernment of the value of documents.

A little lower down, p. 56, § 71, where he supposes the existence of "mixture from without," and proceeds to trace its consequences in the same group as before considered, we read—

"Again, it is possible that the reading of $\alpha\beta$ is itself due to mixture with a text independent of O: and if so, though rightly rejected from the determination of the reading of O, it may possibly be of use in determining the reading of an ancestor of O, or even of the autograph itself."

But if the text from which "mixture" has been derived is external to O, we ought to have some ground for supposing that it is more nearly connected with the ancestry of O; and, if it were more nearly connected, it is not easy to see how to the descendant O of that ancestry it should be purely external. Or put the case thus:—it contains elements common to the ancestry of O with others wholly foreign. So far as the former are contained in O, we know them already. So far as they are not, we have no test to discern them from those purely foreign. This, however, is a bye-point merely, and only adduced to show the lack of cogency in the logical structure at one more point. Our professor adds further, pp. 56-7:—

"When O has come to mean the autograph, we have in reaching the earliest known divergence, arrived at the point where genealogical method finally ceases to be applicable. . . . Whatever variations survive at this ultimate divergence must still stand as undecided variations."

When we have reached "the autograph" (of course as represented in the results of investigation) what further room for "divergence" there is, is not clear. One would have thought that by the fact of reaching the autograph all lines would *converge* so far as they have been conducting us thither. That they stop short of coincidence, and present us with a dual, or possibly in some cases a multiple, result, as readings of that autograph, is a distinct fact; but to speak of the lines which thus terminate as being "at this ultimate *divergency*," seems a use of phrase the inverse of that which represents the thought. One may just pause to notice by the way, that those who have examined carefully the variants of the New Testament in a well furnished register, such as Tischendorf's last edition, must have noticed here and there the fact of duality, as suggested above. The close balance of testimony in MSS. may be sometimes relieved by Versions or Fathers turning the scale. But there occurs occasionally a concurrence of equilibrium in all the elements of attestation *pro* and *con*, which reduces us to a critical dead-lock, and makes us suspect an original double recension in the first age of some of the New Testament documents. Indeed, we can without much difficulty account for this. Given the presence of Apostolic men in nearly all existing Churches at the end of the first century—to say nothing of the, at any rate, one then surviving Apostle—we see how modifications of the text under their authority might easily arise. Thus Timothy or Epaphroditus, or even perhaps Tertius the scribe, might from personal knowledge alter a Pauline MS., with complete approval and reception, whilst earlier duplicates might retain the first-hand reading. When we remember the practice of St. Paul in favour of amanuenses, which probably was not, among the original authors of the New Testament, confined to him alone; and make allowances for circumstances of pressure and distraction disturbing the even flow of sentences alike from the lip

and from the pen, amidst "the care of all the Churches," it seems humanly almost certain that some primary aberrations from intended sense would occur, which would call for such subsequent correction wherever a competent source of it was at hand. Thus, as there were rival traditions concerning Easter, each with its alleged apostolic source, a longer and a shorter recension of the Lord's Prayer, a longer and shorter ultimate form of creed, due (roughly speaking) to East and West respectively; so duality may have its type in the ultimate authorities for the New Testament text, and the problem be found by the critic to resemble a quadratic equation with its two roots. The closing verses of St. Mark's Gospel, and the passage of the woman taken in adultery, are probably examples of similar secondary but genuine influences at work upon the text of the Gospels. We approach in short the ultimate condition of a binary text (or possibly in some cases a ternary or more, but it is best to keep within the narrowest margin reconcilable with the facts); and such may possibly be the account of the "Western" text of Professor Hort, so far as that text has a reality, and is a genuine deviation from a standard tradition, and not a mere erroneous result of wrong grouping of authorities under the influence of "method," or of subjectivity vitiating the application of it. We have not the worked out steps of this "method" before us, either as regards the codices of the New Testament, or the widely diffused types of "Western," etc., texts which they are believed to follow. Nor could such investigations be submitted within the compass of an "Introduction." But, put broadly, the result as regards codices is the exaltation of two of them into a position of practically ultimate authority, as superior, for instance, to a consensus of early versions and Fathers, where that may be found. The weight thus attributed to them perhaps reflects that of the Westcott-Hort duumvirate in the Revisers' Committee. But I should

think it unworthy of the sacred science to cavil even at this result, without showing, as I conceive has been shown above, a flaw in the theory which supports it. I note in conclusion, that there yet remains one further ground for demurring to the supremacy with which B and \aleph are invested. Each of these codices has an Old Testament portion. The character of each as a witness must be taken *as a whole*. The Old Testament portion of each is probably in bulk many times larger than its New Testament portion, when the *lacune* in either portion of either codex have been duly allowed for. I have seen no such rigorous examen of the LXX. portion, which presumably includes the Apocrypha, in each, as has been applied to the New Testament. Here then there remains a wide area of attestation to be searched. Who can say that the character of B and of \aleph for fidelity might not be greatly modified by a careful scrutiny of their Old Testament contents? To hoist them up into the position of ultimate arbiters, until this doubt has been settled, is to snatch a verdict on a mere fraction of the whole evidence, and to affect certainty while a wide margin of phenomena remains unexplored. Of course the merits or demerits of the Westcott-Hort "method" are wholly independent of this extra reason for demurring at its results, but it seems pertinent to put in this reminder when putting those results into the scale. I wished to have added some remarks on the "Internal Evidence of Groups" and on that of "documents," as forming important, although subsidiary, portions of the "method" before us; but I fear I must defer these through considerations of space. Nothing can deprive Canon Westcott and Professor Hort of the grateful appreciation due to a nearly life-long devotion of high gifts and conscientious efforts to the study of the Sacred Text in all its vastly ramified channels of evidence; nor of the right to speak with that authority, so closely akin to intuition, which is derived from the trained organs, the ripened

faculty and the appreciative sympathy, ever present in their work. If they had not given their reasons and let us into the secret of their "method," we might have taken its results upon trust. As they have taken the more manly and outspoken course, they invite us thereby to follow them in a similar and parallel effort of criticism.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF JOB.—II.

IN the second circle of speeches, chaps. xv.—xxi., the changes made by the Revision are perhaps of less importance than those in the first circle. As before, the most difficult passages occur in the speeches of Job, particularly chaps. xvi., xvii., and xix., those of the other speakers being comparatively simple. The alterations made, however, will generally be found helpful to the understanding of the book as a whole.

In the speech of Eliphaz (chap. xv.) the following points may be noticed. In *v.* 4, "restrainest prayer before God" becomes "restrainest devotion." The charge of Eliphaz is that Job by his words and demeanour infringes upon the reverence due from men to God, a broader charge than that suggested by A.V. The change in *v.* 5 also adds to the force of the charge: "thine iniquity teacheth thy mouth," instead of the former, "thy mouth uttereth thine iniquity." It may remain a question whether the charge of Eliphaz be a general one, to the effect that Job's language was inspired by his evil mind, or particular, namely that his *guile* dictated his charges against God, which were only a pretext put forward to cloak his own conscious wrong-

doing. This is the sense of the second clause and may be the meaning here.

The marg. in v. 8 deserves attention: "dost (didst) thou hearken in the council of God?" The text has been retained virtually unchanged: "Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God?" Again, in v. 11, A.V. "is there any secret thing with thee?" has little pertinency; while R.V. "and the word *that dealeth* gently with thee" indicates that Eliphaz has in mind his own former speech (chaps. iv. v.). There runs throughout this second speech of Eliphaz a constant strain of allusion to his former discourse. The treatment of this discourse by Job has hurt his *amour propre*; it is not what was due to a man of his age and purity of blood. The words suggest, too, that Eliphaz did not quite say in his former speech all that he might have said nor all that was in his mind regarding Job.

Verse 20 has undergone a slight alteration which makes the sense more consistent: the wicked man travaileth with pain all his days, "even the number of years laid up for the oppressor," where A.V. has "and the number of years is hidden to the oppressor." And the same may be said of v. 26, which now reads: "he runneth upon Him (God) with stiff neck, with the thick bosses of his bucklers." Figuratively, the wicked man is represented as assailing God with a stiff neck, and with the bosses of his bucklers directed against Him. The tenses in the whole passage, v. 25-28, are probably all to be read in the past form.

In Job's reply (chaps. xvi., xvii.), the rendering of some individual words has been altered for the better, *e.g.* "what provoketh thee that thou answerest?" v. 3, where A.V. had "what emboldeneth?" v. 4, "I could join words together," for "heap up words" of A.V.; v. 8, "Thou hast laid fast hold on me," instead of "filled me with wrinkles." The slight addition in italics in v. 18, "let my cry have no *resting* place," suggests the meaning better, which is, let

my cry have no place where it shall rest and be silent, but let its appeal for justice sound through all places till it be heard. The rendering in *v.* 19, "He that voucheth for me is on high," is more exact. A.V. has, "my record is on high," but a person, namely God, is intended, the word being parallel to "my witness" in the former clause and of the same meaning. If the language contained such a word as "avoucher" in a personal sense it would express the meaning; but though the verb and one form of noun occur, as Hamlet says, "I might not this believe without the sensible and true avouch of mine own eyes," this particular form either does not occur or would be too obscure.

The change in *v.* 21, is of a different kind, being one of construction. A.V., though expressing a sense compatible enough with the general drift of Job's thoughts, hardly does justice to the desperate condition in which he feels himself at this moment. He has realized that men as well as God have deserted him and hold him guilty, "my friends scorn me." He has only one resort to flee to, the unseen God, his witness and avoucher, and he appeals with tears to Him both against the external God who operates in providence and in events and against men; mine eye poureth out tears unto God "that He would maintain the right of a man with God, and of a son of man with his neighbour." The "man" and "son of man" is Job himself, his neighbour is his friends.

In chap. xvii. 3 the somewhat obscure "lay down now" of A.V. becomes clearer in R.V., "give now a pledge;" and the second clause, "put me in a surety with thee," also is more intelligible in the new form: "be surety for me with thyself," where the same singular duality in Job's conception of God appears as in *v.* 21. Job regarded all the events of providence and of his own history, his misfortunes included, as due immediately to the hand of God, and he moreover regarded the occurrences of providence as

a true index of the mind of God and His disposition toward men, and consequently read in his own history the evidence of the Divine wrath. This was one God. But he was assured there was another, one who knew his integrity and would be his witness and voucher, the moral ideal of man's heart, all whose actual ways ought to correspond to the ideal and must yet correspond. It is his sense of the discordance between the supreme moral ideal and actual providence which he strives to express by speaking of God and God, and his hope is that he shall see the discordance equated and reconciled.

There are ingenious and devout minds who can nourish themselves upon the most unpromising and barren words if found in Scripture ; such words become a mere frame in which they set beautiful pictures drawn by the pious imagination ; and such minds, perhaps, found a sweet meaning in the language of Job as given in A.V., *v.* 6, "aforetime I was as a tabret." A tabret or timbrel is a little drum with bells in the rim, and is a favourite oriental instrument of a lively and joyous kind. Job might perhaps have compared himself to this in his old happy days. Here, however, he appears to be describing what he is now, not what he had been aforetime, and R.V., "I am become an open abhorring," or as marg., "one to be spit on in the face," no doubt expresses the general sense. In A.V. *v.* 12, "the light is short because of darkness," has little meaning. The words are obscure. R.V., however, "the light, *say they*, is near unto darkness," expresses an idea parallel to that of the first clause, "they change the night into day," that is, the three friends are ever putting forward their delusive hopes and foolish comfort, assuring Job that his "night" and "darkness" of calamity and affliction will speedily give place to the "light" and "day" of restoration and prosperity. Job, however, will have none of such comfort, he knows better and is assured of the contrary.

and his assurance is expressed with great pathos in the following verses 13-16, where the slight change in R.V. postponing the apodosis to *v.* 15, is an improvement.

In Bildad's second speech, chap. xviii., several changes occur, of which two or three may be noticed. In *v.* 2 A.V. "how long *will it be ere ye make an end of words?*" is faulty both in grammar and lexicography: R.V. "how long will ye lay snares for words?" that is, hunt for words, in order to find means of replying to the plain and incontrovertible principles of religion advanced by the friends. In *v.* 4 the English is allowed to prevail over the Heb. idiom, "thou that tearest thyself in thine anger," etc. It is known that the ancients did not possess candles, and strict fidelity requires "lamp" where A.V. renders "candle." Some may think that, considering the greater euphony of the latter word and the many fine passages, familiar to the ear and mind, in which it occurs, the change might have been spared. The alteration appears in *v.* 6, where in addition "above him" displaces "with him." A.V. "his candle shall be put out with him," suggests the entirely wrong idea that he and his candle shall be extinguished together; R.V. suggests the idea that the lamp was placed or hung high up in the tent or over the entrance. The prep. might express in a general way the connexion of the sinner and his candle.

In *v.* 13 "strength of his skin" is altered with advantage to "members of his body;" and in *v.* 14 the impersonal construction, "it shall bring him to the king of terrors," is more naturally put in the passive, "he shall be brought," etc. A.V. is obscure in *v.* 15, "it shall dwell in his tabernacle because it is none of his;" R.V., "there shall dwell in his tent that which is (they which are) none of his." The use of "nephew" (*νεπος*, Fr. *neveu*) for grandson is now obsolete, though "grandson" is not a Biblical word; R.V. has compromised the difficulty in *v.* 19 by rendering

“son’s son,” as A.V. in an earlier passage. Finally, the omission of the italic *him*, *v.* 20, suggests that “they that went before” as well as “they that come after” are posterior to the day of the sinner’s destruction. The alternative sense suggested in the marg. is worth attending to.

Apart from the difficult passage, *v.* 23 *seq.*, Job’s reply in chap. xix. is simple. Only two alterations of any consequence have been made. In *v.* 6, “know now that God hath overthrown me” is replaced by the more accurate “hath subverted me *in my cause* ;” and in *v.* 17 the peculiar rendering of A.V., “though I entreated for the children’s sake of mine own body,” is altered into “and my supplication (is strange) to the children of my *mother’s* womb,” with marg. “I am loathsome to the children,” etc. The marg. “I am loathsome,” though without evidence from O.T., is thought to find support in the cognate languages. The rendering affords a parallel to the idea of the first clause, “my breath is strange (offensive) to my wife.” The final words of the verse are obscure ; lit. they read “to the children of my womb.” The last word can be used of the father, and might mean “body,” in which case Job’s own children would be referred to. These, however, according to the prologue, perished ; and as this is sustained by chap. viii. 4 and xxix. 5, it is difficult to assume an inconsequence on the part of the poet in the present passage. It is true that in *v.* 16 Job refers to his “servant,” although his servants are spoken of as having also perished ; but the difficulty is less, since only his servants who were in the fields are alluded to in the prologue. Some have suggested that children of concubines may be intended ; but no such connexions are alluded to, and in conformity with his high character Job is represented as living in strict monogamy. Others have thought of grandchildren, the objection to which is that Job’s sons, though they had houses of their own, do not appear to have been married. Either, therefore, we

must assume a slight inconsistency on the part of the poet, or render as R.V., "children of my mother's womb;" in the latter case Job would call the womb that bore him "his" womb, and would refer to brothers and sisters or collateral connexions.

The apparent anachronism, "printed in a book," v. 23, is removed by the rendering of R.V. "inscribed." The notable verses 25-27 were rather an interpretation in A.V. than a translation, and by the removal of all the words interpolated R.V. gains greatly in fairness. A.V. "he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth," v. 25, contains a reference too definite; R.V. "he shall stand up at the last," is more just. The rendering of A.V. v. 26, "*though* after my skin *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God," expresses a perfectly unambiguous sense, and contains an explicit declaration of faith in the resurrection of the flesh. This sense, however, is gained by interpolating three words: *though*, *worms* and *body*; and though these interpolations may be in harmony with exegetical tradition, they can hardly be justified. The rendering of R.V., "and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God," is much fairer, though readers will probably complain of its ambiguity. The words "from my flesh" naturally mean the same as "in my flesh" of A.V., and some may still find the doctrine of the resurrection in the verse. Others will not unnaturally fasten on the apparent distinction introduced between "skin" and "flesh," and conclude that what Job's assurance amounts to is this: that though his disease go the length of committing frightful ravages in his "skin," *i.e.*, perhaps, his body superficially, yet in his mangled body—his "flesh"—and before death, he shall still see God. While others may obtain a similar sense by a different road. It may occur to them that "skin" and "flesh" may be identical in meaning, being mere variant expressions for "body," and that Job's statement is put in the form of

a paradox, "though my body be destroyed, yet in my body shall I see God," the meaning being that, though his disease should bring him to virtual annihilation, yet even in that condition and before death he should see God. That the verse is susceptible of a sense quite different is indicated by the marg. on "from my flesh," namely, "without my flesh," that is, disembodied and after death. The American Revisers continue to hold out for this sense, and the reader may refer to their rendering of the verse as a whole at the end of the O.T. According to this rendering, Job postpones his hope of seeing God till a future life, as we should now say, or, as would be said more accurately on O.T. ground, till after death.

In the speech of Zophar, chap. xx., a few changes occur which help to make that hot disputant's points clearer. He acknowledges that he is warm, and his impetuosity makes his opening sentences somewhat abrupt. R.V. with marg. on *v.* 3 may be referred to without quotation. Zophar's doctrine in the whole passage is that the wicked man's ill-gotten wealth does not abide with him, he has to restore it; his sweet pleasures turn to gall and the poison of asps within him; he must vomit up again all that he has so greedily swallowed. These harsh figures are crowded together with a reference to Job's history which is scarcely veiled. In this light, *v.* 10, "his hands shall restore their goods" is more pertinently "his goods" in R.V. In *v.* 20 A.V., "surely he shall not feel quietness in his belly" seems to express a rather curious threat; R.V. refers the verse rightly to the past career of the wicked man and his insatiable greed, "because he knew no quietness within him" (in his belly, the seat of appetite). In A.V. *v.* 21 has little sense, "there shall none of his meat be left;" R.V. "there was nothing left that he devoured not." In *v.* 23, "when he is about to fill his belly" has been retained in R.V., but with the marg. "let it be (it shall be) for the fillin of his

belly that" God shall cast the fierceness of His wrath upon him. In the last clause A.V. has also been retained, "and shall rain it upon him while he is eating," though with marg. "rain it upon him as his food." Both these margins are deserving of attention.

In Job's reply, ch. xxi., though the changes are not numerous they are of the utmost importance, and have the effect of altering the whole complexion of the chapter as A.V. allows it to be read. To the doctrine of Zophar in the previous chapter, which was the doctrine of all the three friends, that the wicked man is always miserable and invariably comes to a wretched end, Job opposes a direct negative, and shows by instances which cannot be gainsaid that such an assertion is false. He admits that his friends' doctrine ought to be true; it is what the conscience of man demands to be true, and what the providence of God, if it were righteous and corresponded to the ideal in man's mind, would show to be true, but the facts of life and history tell quite a different tale; and the tale is so full of mystery and of moral failure on the part of the Ruler of all, that Job, when he thinks of it, is troubled, and horror taketh hold of his flesh (*v.* 6).

In *v.* 14 a change of the slightest kind alters the whole drift of the passage. In pursuance of his argument against the three friends, Job directs attention to the multiplication of the wicked, the joyous happiness of their children, the prosperity of their flocks, and their own peaceful end at last (*v.* 7-13), and then according to A.V. adds, "therefore they say unto God, Depart from us" (*v.* 14). This reading makes the worldly ease and felicity of the wicked the source of their impiety. Now this might be a conclusive proof of the ingratitude of men, but it would be no arraignment of the providence of God, and nothing relevant to Job's contention. R.V. renders, "yet they said unto God, Depart from us"—that is, though they were persons who would have none of

God, yet every worldly blessing was showered upon them. Again, A.V. reads *v.* 17 as an exclamation with an affirmative meaning, "how oft is the candle of the wicked put out!" R.V. as a question, "how oft is it that," etc.? meaning, what examples can be shown of such a thing? there is no such law of providence to be observed. In these verses 17, 18, Job directly traverses the theory of his friends. Once more the whole scope of *vv.* 19-21 is altered by the insertion of the italic *ye say* in R.V. *v.* 19. The friends, in answer to Job's evidence of the happiness of many a wicked man himself, fall back upon the old doctrine of retribution: "God layeth up his iniquity for his children," to which Job replies "let Him recompense it unto himself . . . for what pleasure (concern) has he in his house after him?" The passage is very curious and instructive. We can infer from the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel that the miseries of the exile had begun to react upon the doctrine of retribution formerly accepted. The people concluded that they were being punished for the sins of their ancestors, "the fathers ate sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." The generation of the exile were suffering not for their own but for their fathers' transgressions, and they began in their misery to question the rectitude of the providential law. Job does not attack the law on the side of its injustice, but assails it on another ground, namely, that as a law of retribution it is a failure, it lays the penalty on the wrong parties—"let his own eyes see his destruction." Though his children suffer the wicked man himself escapes, for what knowledge has he of his house after him or what concern in it? Both the proverb in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the present passage, imply that men were now occupying a different point of view from that of Hebrew antiquity. The old view as illustrated in the case of Korah and other instances, appears to have been this: a man's children or family and dependents were regarded as part of himself,

hence his punishment if thorough included them, or if they suffered after him it was still retribution on *him*, he was being still pursued by vengeance in them, who were his and part of him. He was not supposed to represent them so that his evil might be imputed to them and considered theirs—such an idea inverts the whole conception—on the contrary the standing of the children or dependents as distinct and independent persons was not considered, they were comprehended in the father or head. This view was breaking up in the age to which the Book of Job belongs. The dissatisfaction of men with it was a symptom of a general change that was coming over O.T. conceptions. The individual, with his rights and responsibilities immediately before God, was the new conception which was to lay the foundation for a truer order of things. Both in Ezekiel and in Job the father and his children are regarded as quite distinct from one another, the latter are independent persons. Hence in the prophet the law that the children suffer for the sins of the father is assailed as doing an injustice to the children, while in Job it is repudiated, because it fails to touch the father. The individualism of Ezekiel has been attacked by some writers as carried to an extreme which is far more false than the old view which it would displace. All questions of this kind are complicated in the O.T. by the fact that two things are mixed up which fuller revelation and larger experience have taught us to keep apart, namely, the religious relation of the individual soul to God, and the external token and pledge of this relation in the person's worldly prosperity or the reverse. The contribution which Ezekiel makes is to the former point, the individual's freedom and responsibility and reward or the reverse according to his conduct. What entangles his teaching to us is that he appears to leave the second point untouched, the favour and displeasure of God continue to be manifested externally, remaining untranslated into the forms of spiritual experience.

In v. 32 the marg. "that the evil man is spared in the day of calamity," etc. is certainly much more in harmony with the general scope of the chapter than the text "is reserved for the day of calamity." Job is supposed by some to modify his views in chap. xxvii., but here he is delivering a crushing assault upon the stronghold of his friends, and he is not likely to cripple his attack by considerations of another kind.

In the third circle of speeches (chap. xxii.-xxxi.) there is a multitude of changes; but though useful, few of them are of such importance as those just noticed. In the opening speech of Eliphaz, chap. xxii., the following may be referred to. In v. 4, "will He reprove thee for fear of thee?" is more accurate in R.V., "is it for thy fear *of Him* that He reproveth thee?" More important is the alteration in v. 15, where "wilt thou keep the old way?" (*i.e.* the way of the ancient sinners) takes the place of A.V. "hast thou marked the old way?" A.V. v. 20 has little meaning; R.V., by inserting the italic *saying*, connects the verse with the preceding and otherwise modifies it. In A.V. v. 24, "then shalt thou lay up gold as dust," etc., is a promise of riches to Job on his returning to God; R.V. gives the words quite another turn, making them a warning to Job against his love of wealth, "lay thou thy treasure in the dust . . . and the Almighty shall be thy treasure." The very curious rendering of A.V. (v. 30), "He shall deliver the island of the innocent," arose from confounding 'N, an island, with 'N, a form of the negative; R.V., "He shall deliver *even* him that is not innocent."

In Job's reply, chap. xxiii., xxiv., xxiii. 2 remains obscure for all that can be done to it. Verse 6, "No; but he would put *strength* in me," has no relevancy in the connexion. Job fancies himself pleading before the judgment seat of God, and asks how he should wish God to receive him; hence R.V., "Nay; but He would give heed to

me." In *v.* 17, which remains virtually as in A.V., the marg. offers quite a different view of the meaning. The text taken in connexion with the preceding, God hath made my heart faint and the Almighty hath troubled me (*v.* 16) "because I was not cut off before the darkness," etc., appears to mean that Job is troubled and perplexed because God had not caused him to die before such awful calamities befell him. Of course if Job had been dead he would not have been here discussing mysteries of providence any more; but in the sense in which he speaks, his being "cut off" would have been just the same mystery as now alarms him. The marg. suggests a profound and pathetic sense, and one in the line of all Job's statements, namely, that it is not his calamities in themselves nor his death that Job is affrighted at; it is the moral aspect of his afflictions, the fact that *God* causes them in defiance of rectitude, that paralyses his mind. The marg. runs: "for I am not dismayed because of the darkness (affliction), nor because thick darkness covereth my face." It was not a question of the sufferings or death of him or any man; the moral Sun in heaven was labouring under disastrous eclipse.

Chap. xxiv. 1 is clearer in R.V., "why are times (of assize) not laid up by the Almighty? and why do not they that know Him see his days" (of judgment)? The pious, who know God, cannot perceive His righteous rule on earth. A.V. "why, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty, do they that know Him not see His days?" appears to assume that God has days for doing judgment appointed by Him, and to complain that men cannot see them. The distinction is one not drawn by Job. The complaint that men cannot see Him doing judgment, dispensing right upon the earth, is a complaint that right is not dispensed by Him.

The changes in this chapter are too numerous to notice

in detail; the attention of the reader may be directed to two landmarks set up by R.V.: *v.* 9, "there are that pluck," etc.; and *v.* 13, "these are of them that rebel," etc. The passage *v.* 18 to the end is difficult of interpretation; many consider *v.* 18-21 to give the popular view of the fate that awaits the sinners described in the previous verses, while *v.* 22-25 give a very different view of their fate, a view which is Job's own. If this construction of the passage be adopted the marg. of *v.* 22 should be substituted for the text, which as it stands is rather obscure.

In Bildad's brief speech, chap. xxv., there is no change requiring notice. In Job's reply, chap. xxvi., two or three useful changes have been made. In *v.* 5, A.V., "dead things are formed from under the waters," has no meaning at all; R.V., "they that are deceased tremble beneath the waters," etc. The reference is to the realm of the dead and the shades (*Refuim*) congregated there; this abode of the departed was considered to be beneath the sea. Again, *v.* 9, "He holdeth back the face of His throne," is obscure; R.V., "He closeth in the face of His throne," *i.e.* with clouds. And as in a former passage, "Rahab" takes the place of "the proud," *v.* 12.

Chaps. xxvii., xxviii. are encompassed with difficulties when the question of their integral connexion with the book is considered. Otherwise the chapters are of no great difficulty, though in the beginning of both some great and useful changes have been introduced. Chap. xxvii. 3 has been thrown into a parenthesis in R.V. and made to express Job's consciousness and mental clearness in spite of his wasting malady, and thus to add weight to the asseveration of his innocence which he is about to make. This asseveration follows in *v.* 4-6. The text of these verses reads, "my lips shall not speak unrighteousness" (*v.* 4), "my heart shall not reproach me," etc. The marg. suggests presents for these futures: "my lips do not speak

unrighteousness," *i.e.* in maintaining my innocence; "my heart doth not reproach me," *i.e.* I have no consciousness of sin; a sense with which goes the rendering, "for any of my days." Of course it has always to be remembered that Job is not here arrogating to himself absolute sinlessness; he is merely repudiating the kind of sins insinuated against him by his friends and implied (as he supposed) by his misfortunes.

In chap. xxviii. 1 the marg. "for," instead of "surely," suggests a close connexion between the chapters. Verses 3, 4, are made much clearer in R.V. by the insertion of the word *man* for "he" in v. 3, "*man* setteth an end to darkness;" as well as by making "man" the subject in v. 4, instead of "the flood" as A.V. In A.V. v. 4 has no meaning, while R.V. by referring it to the operations of the miner offers a graphic picture of the dangers and the successes of ancient mining. The change of "rivers" into "channels," v. 10, and the rendering, "he bindeth the streams that they trickle not," v. 11, help to vivify the description.

In Job's last speech, chap. xxix.-xxxi., most difficulties occur in chap. xxx., and there a number of changes have been introduced, *e.g.* "they gnaw the ground," instead of "fleeing into the wilderness," v. 3; "they were scourged out of the land," instead of "they were viler than the earth," v. 8; "the *pains* that gnaw me take no rest," instead of "my sinews take no rest," v. 17; "Thou dissolvest me in the storm," instead of "Thou dissolvest my substance," v. 22, and others. The well-known passage, xxxi. 35, "Oh that one would hear me! behold, my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book," appears in R.V. thus: "Oh that I had one to hear me! (Lo, here is my signature, let the Almighty answer me;) and that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written!" Job

desires that he had one that would answer him, meaning that God would appear to justify or explain his afflictions ; to his own protestation of innocence he appends his signature and waits for the Almighty's reply in opposition to it ; the indictment or charge of God his opponent is what he longs to possess, for then the riddle of his sorrows would be solved.

It is unnecessary and would be tedious to adduce further instances. Enough has been noticed to indicate the kind of changes that have been introduced, and the bearing which many of them have upon the general scope and leading conceptions of the book, and also perhaps to commend to the reader's attention the margin in many places where A.V. has still been retained or only slightly modified.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE PROPHECIES OF ST. PAUL.

III.—THE LATER EPISTLES.

THE distribution of predictive passages through the letters written by St. Paul during his first imprisonment,—Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and Philippians (A.D. 62 and 63),—is analogous to what we have observed in the preceding group. In the more theological and polemical letters, as there, so here, such passages are few, while in the more practical and personal letters they are comparatively numerous. The Second Advent is not directly mentioned at all in Ephesians, and only once, and then very incidentally, in Colossians ; while, although the brief and purely occasional letter to Philemon naturally enough contains no allusions to the future, the Epistle to the Philippians, which resembles in general manner and contents the letters

to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, like them too is full of them. The nature of the eschatological matter which is found in each epistle is in striking harmony with its purpose and general character: in Ephesians and Colossians it is confined to allusions, sometimes somewhat obscure, to eschatological facts which are introduced usually with a theological or polemic object; in Philippians, where Paul pours out his heart, it is free and rich, and usually has a direct personal design of encouragement or consolation. In all these epistles alike, however, it is introduced only incidentally—no section has it as its chief end to record the future; but in Philippians it is more fully and lovingly dwelt upon, in Ephesians and Colossians more allusively touched. It is not surprising, under such circumstances, that very little is revealed to us concerning the future in these epistles beyond what was already contained in the earlier letters, the teaching of which most commonly furnishes the full statement of the facts here briefly referred to. Now and then, however, they cast a ray of light on points or sides of the truth which were not before fully illuminated, and thus enable us to count distinct gains from their possession. Nowhere are they out of harmony with what the earlier epistles have revealed.

The eschatological contents of the twin letters, Ephesians and Colossians, will illustrate all this very sharply. Much is made in them of an inheritance of hope laid up in heaven for the saints in light (Eph. i. 14, cf. ii. 7; Col. i. 12, i. 5: cf. iii. 24). The time of its realization is when Christ our life shall be manifested, at which time we also shall be manifested with Him in glory (Col. iii. 4). It is clearly pre-supposed that the reception of the inheritance is conditioned on a previous judgment. We must be made meet for it by the Father, by a deliverance from the power of darkness and translation into the kingdom of Him by whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins (Col. i. 12).

Whatsoever good thing each one does, the same he shall certainly receive from the Lord (Eph. vi. 8). The inheritance itself is thus a recompence for our service here (Col. iii. 24). Judgment again is implied in the constant undertone of allusion to a presentation of us by God or Christ, pure and blameless and unaccusable at once before Christ and in Christ (Eph. i. 22; Col. i. 22, 28). But if Christ is thus the judge, we naturally enough are to live our life here in His fear (Eph. v. 21). The resurrection of the saints is implied now and then (Col. ii. 12, 13; cf. Eph. v. 23), and once asserted in the declaration that Christ has become "the first-born from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence" (Col. i. 18). The nature of this inter-adventual period is explained with apparent reference to some such teaching as is given in 1 Cor. xv. 25, to be a period of conflict (Eph. vi. 12), and its opening days are hence said to be evil (Eph. v. 16), though, no doubt, the evil will decrease as conflict passes into victory. The enemies of the Lord are named as principalities and powers, and their subjugation was potentially completed at His death and resurrection (Col. ii. 15). The actual completion of the victory and subjection of all things to the Son is briefly re-stated in each epistle. In the one it is declared that God has purposed with reference to the dispensation of the fulness of the times (*i.e.* this present dispensation of the ends of the ages, 1 Cor. x. 11) to gather again all things as under one head in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon earth (Eph. i. 10). In the other it is said that it was the Father's good pleasure that all the fulness should dwell in the Son, and that through Him all things should be reconciled to Him, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens, and that this reconciliation should be wrought by His blood out-poured on the cross (Col. i. 19). The only difference between such statements and such a one as 2 Cor. v. 19 is

that these deal with the universe, while that treats only of man, and hence these presuppose the full teaching implied in 1 Cor. xv. 20-28 and Rom. viii. 18-25, and sum up in a single pregnant sentence the full effects of the Saviour's work. The method of Christ's attack on the principalities and powers and world-rulers of this darkness and spiritual hosts of wickedness, and the means by which He will work His victory, are declared at Eph. vi. 12; from which we learn—as we might have guessed from Rom. xi. 25, *sq.*—that Christians are His soldiers in this holy war, and it is through our victory that His victory is known. It is easy to see that there is nothing new in all this, and yet there is much that has the appearance of being new. We see everything from a different angle; the light drops upon it from a new point, and the effect is to bring out new relations in the old truths and give us a feeling of its substantialness. We become more conscious that we are looking at solid facts, with fronts and backs and sides, standing each in due and fixed relations to all.

The Epistle to the Philippians differs from the others of its group only in dwelling more lingeringly on the matters it mentions, and thus transporting us back into the full atmosphere of Corinthians and Thessalonians. Here, too, Paul thinks of the advent chiefly in the aspect of the judgment at which we are to receive our eternal approval and reward or disapproval and rejection. He is sure that He who began a good work in His readers will perfect it, until the day of Jesus Christ (i. 6); he prays that they may be pure and void of offence against the day of Christ (i. 10); he desires them to complete their Christian life that he may have whereof to glory in the day of Christ that he did not run in vain, neither labour in vain (ii. 16). These sentences might have come from any of the earlier epistles. The events of the day of the Lord are detailed quite in the spirit of the earlier epistles in iii. 20, 21. Our

real home, the commonwealth in which is our citizenship, is heaven, from whence we patiently await a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation so that it shall be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself. These two verses compress within their narrow compass most of the essential features of Paul's eschatology: Christ's present enthronement as King of the state in which our citizenship is, in heaven, from whence we are to expect Him to return in due time; our resurrection and the nature of our new bodies on the one side as no longer bodies of humiliation, on the other as like Christ's resurrection body, and hence glorious; Christ's conquest of all things to Himself, and last of all of death, in our resurrection, of which, therefore, all His other conquests are a guerdon.

The description of our resurrection bodies as conformed to Christ's glorified body is important in itself, and all the more so as it helps us to catch the meaning of the almost immediately preceding statement (iii. 10 *sq.*) of Paul's deep desire "to know Christ and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His suffering, becoming conformed unto His death, if by any means he may attain to the resurrection of the dead." It has become somewhat common to see in this passage a hint that Paul knew only of a resurrection of the redeemed, and himself expected to rise only in case he was savingly united to Christ. This exposition receives, no doubt, some colour from the phraseology used; but when we observe the intensely moral nature of the longing, as expressed in the immediately subsequent context, we cannot help limiting the term "resurrection from the dead" here, by the added idea of resurrection to glory, and the full statement of verse 21 inevitably throws back its light upon it. It is not mere resurrection that Paul longs for; he gladly becomes con-

formed to Christ in His death that he may be conformed to Him in His resurrection also, and the gist of the whole passage is bound up in this idea of conformity to Christ, with which it opens (verse 10) and with which it closes (verse 21). To think of two separate resurrections here—of the just and the unjust—in the former of which Paul desires to rise, is to cut the knot, not untie it. Nothing in the language suggests it—the “resurrection from the dead” is as unlimited¹ as the “death” that precedes it. Nothing in the context demands or even allows it. Nothing anywhere in Paul’s writings justifies it. It is inconsistent with what we have found Paul saying about the second Advent and its relation to the end, at 1 Cor. xv. 20–28. And finally it is contradicted by his explicit statements concerning the general resurrection, in the discourses in Acts which are closest in time to the date of these letters, and which ought to be considered along with them, especially Acts xxiv. 15, where in so many words the resurrection is made to include both the just and unjust (cf. xxiii. 6; xxvi. 8; xxvi. 23; xxviii. 20). The limitation which the context supplies in our present passage is not that of class, much less that of time, but that of result; Paul longs to be conformed to Christ in resurrection as in death—he is glad to suffer with Him that he may be also glorified together with Him. Yea, he counts his sufferings but refuse, if he may gain Christ and *be found in Him*, clothed in the righteousness which is by faith. This is the ruling thought which conditions the statements of verse 11, and is openly returned to at verse 21.

The mention of the subjection of all things to Christ in verse 21, which recalls the teaching of 1 Cor. xv. 20–28 again, was already prepared for by the account of the glory which God gave the Son as a reward for His work of suffering, in ii. 9–11. There His supreme exaltation

¹ On ἐκανάστασις, see Meyer *in loc.*

is stated to have been given Him of God for a purpose—that all creation should be subjected to Him, should bow the knee to His Name and confess Him to be Lord to the glory of God the Father. The completion of this purpose Paul here (iii. 21) asserts Christ to have the power to bring about, but nothing is implied in either passage as to the rapidity of its actual realization.

Some have thought, however, that in this epistle also Paul expresses his confidence that all should be fulfilled in his own time. Plainly, however, the reference of the completion of our moral probation, or of our victory over the present humiliation, to the Second Advent goes no further than to leave the possibility of its coming in our generation open (i. 6; iii. 21), and the latter at least is conditioned by the desire for a good resurrection, which is earnestly expressed immediately before. “The Lord is at hand” (iv. 5) would be more to the point, if its reference to time and the Second Advent were plainer. But although it was early so understood (*e.g.* by Barnabas), it can hardly be properly so taken. It is, indeed, scarcely congruous to speak of a person as near in time; we speak of events or actions, times or seasons as near, meaning it temporally; but when we say a person is near, we mean it inevitably of a space-relation. And the connexion of the present verse points even more strongly in the same direction. Whether we construe it with what goes before, or with what comes after—whether we read “Let your gentleness be known to all men, [for] the Lord is near,” or “The Lord is near, [therefore] be anxious for nothing, but in everything . . . let your requests be made known unto God,”—the reference to God’s continual nearness to the soul for help is preferable to that to the Second Advent. And if, as seems likely, the latter connexion be the intended one, the contextual argument is pressing. The fact that the same

phrase occurs in the Psalter in the space-sense, and must have been therefore in familiar use in this sense by Paul and his readers alike, while the asyndetic, proverbial way in which it is introduced here gives it the appearance of a quotation, adds all that was needed to render this interpretation of it here certain.

The Apostle's real feelings towards the future life are clearly exposed to us in the touching words of i. 21 *sq.*, the close resemblance of which to 2 Cor. v. 1-10 is patent. Here he does not refer in the remotest way to a hope of living to see the advent, but begins where he ended in 2 Corinthians, with the assertion of his personal preference for death rather than life, because death brought the gain of being with Christ, "which is far better." Even the "naked" intermediate state of the soul, between death and resurrection, is thus in Paul's view to be chosen rather than a life at home in the body but abroad from the Lord. Yet he does not therefore choose to die: "but what if to live in the flesh—this means fruit of my work?" he pauses to ask himself, and can but answer that he is in a strait betwixt the two, and finally that since to die is advantageous to himself alone, while to live is more needful for his converts, he knows he shall abide still a while in this world. To him, too, man here is but

"A hasty traveller
Posting between the present and the future.
That baits awhile in this dull fleshly tavern;"

and yet, though this tent-dwelling is seen by him in all its insufficiency and inefficiency, like the good Samaritan he is willing to prolong his stay in even so humble a caravanserai (iii. 21) for the succouring of his fellows—may, like the Lord Himself, he counts the glory of the heavenly life not a thing to be graspingly seized, so long as by humbling himself to the form of a tenant here he

may save the more. The spirit that was in Christ dwelt within him.

The eschatology of the Pastoral Epistles—1 Timothy, Titus, and 2 Timothy (A.D. 67, 68)—the richest depository of which is the Second Epistle to Timothy, is indistinguishable from that of the other Pauline letters. In these letters again the Second Advent is primarily and most prominently conceived as the closing act of the world, the final judgment of men, and therefore the goal of all their moral endeavours. Timothy is strenuously exhorted “to keep the commandment,” that is, the evangelical rule of life, “spotless and irreproachable until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Tim. vi. 14). All of Paul’s confidence is based on his persuasion that Jesus Christ, the abolisher of death and bringer of life and incorruption to light through the Gospel, is able to guard his deposit¹ against that day” (2 Tim. ii. 12), and that there is laid up for him the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give him at that day (2 Tim. iv. 8). “And not to me only,” he adds, as if to guard against his confidence seeming one personal to himself, “but also to all them that have loved His appearing.” Though at that day the Lord will render to Alexander according to his works (2 Tim. iv. 14), he will grant mercy to Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i. 6); and in general he will attach to godliness the promise both of the life that now is and that which is to come (1 Tim. iv. 8).

It follows, therefore, that for all those in Christ the Second Advent is a blessed hope to be waited for with patience, but also with loving desire and longing. Christians are described as those that love Christ’s appearing (2 Tim. iv. 8), and the hope of it is blessed (Titus ii. 13) because it is the epiphany of the glory of our great God

¹ τὴν παραθήκην μου = “what I have entrusted to him.”

and Saviour Jesus Christ, even as the former coming was the epiphany of His grace (Titus ii. 13, cf. 11). It is implied that as the grace so the glory is for Christ's children. What this glory consists in is not, however, very sharply defined. It is the deposit of life and incorruption that the Saviour holds in trust for His children (2 Tim. x. 12). It is the crown of righteousness which the righteous Judge will bestow upon them (2 Tim. iv. 8). It is freedom from all iniquity (Titus ii. 14). It is the actual inheritance of the eternal life now hoped for (Titus iii. 7). But all this is description rather than definition. Nothing is said of resurrection except that they gravely err who think it already past (2 Tim. ii. 18). Nothing of the new bodies to be given to the saints, or of any of the glories that accompany the final triumph. What is said describes only the full realization of what is already enjoyed in its first fruits here or what comes in some abundance in the imperfect intermediate state.

For the glories of the advent do not blind Paul to the bliss of a Christian's hope in "this world," whether in the body or out of the body. In the fervid music of a Christian hymn the Apostle assures his son Timothy of his own steadfast faith in the faithful saying (2 Tim. ii. 11-13):—

" If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him;
If we endure we shall also reign with Him;
If we shall deny Him, He will also deny us;
If we are faithless—He abideth faithful.
For He cannot deny Himself."

And death itself, he says, can but "save him into Christ's heavenly kingdom" (2 Tim. iv. 18). The partaking in Christ's death and life in this passage seems to be meant ethically; and the co-regnancy with the Lord that is promised to the suffering believer apparently concerns the being with Christ in the heavenly kingdom,—whether in the body or abroad from the body. Thus the Apostle is

not here contemplating the glories of the advent, but comforting and strengthening himself with the profitableness of godliness in its promise of the life that now is, under the epiphany of God's grace, when we can be but looking for the epiphany of His glory. That he expects death (for now he was sure of death, 2 Tim. iv. 6) to introduce him into Christ's heavenly kingdom advertises to us that that kingdom is now in progress, and 2 Tim. iv. 1 is in harmony with this just because it tells us nothing at all of the time of the kingdom.¹

About Christ's reign and work as king—in other words, concerning the nature of this period in which we live—these epistles are somewhat rich in teaching. These “latter times” or “last days”²—for these are, according to the fixed usage of the times, the designations under which the Apostle speaks of the dispensation of the Spirit,—are not to be an age of idleness or of sloth among Christians; but, in harmony with the statements of the earlier letters, which represented it as a time of conflict with and conquest of evil, it is here pictured as a time in which apostasies shall occur (1 Tim. iv. 1), and false doctrines flourish along with evil practices (2 Tim. iii. 1, *sq.*), when the just shall suffer persecution, and evil men and impostors wax worse and worse (2 Tim. iii. 13), and, even in the Church, men shall not endure sound doctrine, but shall introduce teachers after their own lusts (2 Tim. iv. 3 *sq.*). It would be manifestly illegitimate to understand these descriptions as necessarily covering the life of the whole dispensation on the earliest verge of which the prophet was standing. Some of these evils had already

¹ Notice that the correct translation is: “I charge thee before God and Christ Jesus who shall judge the quick and the dead, and by His appearing and by His kingdom.” Each item is adduced entirely separately; the Apostle is accumulating the incitements to action, not giving a chronological list, which, in any case, the passage does not furnish.

² ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς, 1 Tim. iv. 1; ἐν ὀσχύταις ἡμέραις, 2 Tim. iii. 1.

broken out in his own times, others were pushing up the ground preparatory to appearing above it themselves. It is historically plain to us, no doubt, that they suitably describe the state of affairs up to at least our own day. But we must remember that all the indications are that Paul had the first stages of "the latter times" in mind, and actually says nothing to imply either that the evil should long predominate over the good, or that the whole period should be marked by such disorders.

When the Lord should come, he indeed keeps as uncertain in these epistles as in all his former ones. In 2 Timothy he expects his own death immediately, and he contemplates it with patience and even joy, no longer with the shrinking expressed in 2 Corinthians. It is all the more gratuitous to insist here that the natural reference of Timothy's keeping the faith to the advent as the judgment (1 Tim. vi. 14), implies that he confidently expected that great closing event at once or very soon. On the contrary it is reiterated in the same context that God alone knows the times and seasons, in the assertion that God would show the epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ "in His own times." Beyond this the Apostle never goes; and it is appropriate that in his earliest and latest epistles especially he should categorically assert the absolute uncertainty of the time of the consummation (1 Thess. v. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 15). Surely an intense personal conviction that the times and seasons were entirely out of his knowledge can alone account for so consistent an attitude of complete uncertainty.

It appears to be legitimate to affirm in the light of the preceding pages that it is clear that there is such a thing as a Pauline eschatology; a consistent teaching on the last things which runs through the whole mass of his writings, not filling them, indeed, as some would have us

believe, but appearing on their surface like daisies in a meadow—here in tolerable profusion, there in quite a mass, there scattered one by one at intervals of some distance—everywhere woven into it as constituent parts of the turf carpeting. The main outlines of this eschatology are repeated over and over again, and exhibited from many separate points of view, until we know them from every side and are confident of their contour and exact nature. Details are added to the general picture by nearly every letter; and each detail falls so readily into its place in the outline as to prove both that the Apostle held a developed scheme of truth on this subject, and that we are correctly understanding it. A general recapitulation of the broadest features of his doctrine will alone be necessary in closing.

Paul, then, teaches that as Jesus has once come in humiliation, bringing grace into the world, and God has raised Him to high exaltation and universal dominion in reward for His sufferings and in order to the completion of His work of redemption; so when He shall have put all His enemies under His feet, He shall come again to judgment in an epiphany of glory, to close the dispensation of grace and usher in the heavenly blessedness. The enemies to be conquered are principalities and powers and world-rulers of this darkness and spiritual hosts of wickedness; this whole period is the period of advancing conquest and will end with the victory over the last enemy, death, and the consequent resurrection of the dead. In this advancing conquest Christ's elect are His soldiers, and the conversion of the world—first of the Gentiles, then of the Jews—marks the culminating victory over the powers of evil. How long this conflict continues before it is crowned with complete victory, how long the supreme and sole kingship of Christ endures before He restores the restored realm to His father, the Apostle leaves in complete uncertainty. He predicts the evil days

of the opening battle, the glad days of the victory; and leaves all questions of times and seasons to Him whose own times they are. At the end, however, are the general resurrection and the general judgment, when the eternal rewards and punishments are awarded by Christ as judge, and then, all things having been duly gathered together thus again under one head by Him, he subjects them all to God that He may once more become "all relations among all creations." That the blessed dead may be fitted to remain for ever with the Lord, He gives them each his own body, glorified and purified and rendered the willing organ of the Holy Ghost. Christ's living, though they die not, are "changed" to a like glory. Not only man, but all creation feels the renovation and shares in the revelation of the sons of God, and there is a new heaven and a new earth. And thus the work of the Redeemer is completed, the end has come, and it is visible to men and angels that through Him in whom it was His pleasure that all the fulness should dwell, God has at length reconciled all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross—through Him, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens—yea, even us, who were in times past alienated and enemies, hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present us holy and without blemish and unrepachable before Him.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

Allegheny.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

VIII. THE CONSUMMATION.—CHAP. XIV.

THE highly figurative representation given in this chapter was apparently not intended to be a realistic picture of any one event. It conveys the impression that God and His people will triumph, and will do so by miraculous interposition at the hour when appearances are most against them. It shows us the day of the Lord opening in gloom but light at evening; great calamities falling upon the city of God, but resulting in her being lifted as the conspicuous, life-giving metropolis of the race. When already the enemies of Jerusalem have stormed the city and are sacking it, when she is suffering all the horrors which even well-disciplined troops can scarcely be withheld from inflicting on a town that has long resisted their siege, when heaps of spoil are piled up in her open squares and savage soldiers are quarrelling over the booty, when the women and children and men who have escaped the first slaughter are tremblingly waiting to learn their fate, then the Mount of Olives shall cleave in two parts, and through the valley thus made the inhabitants shall flee. This friendly earthquake is the sign of the Lord's coming, the beginning of that day of the Lord which is described in the remainder of the chapter.

The chief points in this description are that that day, which is *one*, or unique, and known only to the Lord, shall be dim and hazy, a gloomy twilight, but shall clear eventually to bright and cheerful light. There shall also flow through the land both east and west, both to the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, a perennial stream of water, refreshing and fertilizing the whole country. Jehovah shall be owned as God in the whole earth. There shall be one God, and His name One. His sanctuary also shall be elevated

in the sight of all men. Then follows, in vers. 12-19, the announcement that those who refuse to own God and His sanctuary shall be punished; and the prophecy closes with the remarkable prediction that all things shall be holy.

The physical accompaniments of this great day, the murky twilight and earthquake and pestilence, give us no certain outline by which we can represent it to the mind. We turn, therefore, to its spiritual characteristics, the changes which will then be discernible in men's ideas and habits, and here we find much to instruct.

The grand result of this great manifestation, which the prophet entitles "the day of the Lord," is enounced in these words: "The Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord and His name one." This, then, is to be the great result of the world's history, of the world's experience, and of the world's thought. It is not, as we might have expected, the starting-point. But that which all is to lead on and up to is, that men shall at last know and own their God and their unity in Him. The Old Testament prophets sometimes speak of the day of the Lord and of His appearing in terms which fitly apply to the coming of Christ and God's manifestation in Him; but sometimes they use language which is by no means exhausted by that first coming and manifestation, but awaits for its fulfilment some further revelation of the glory of God. This present order of things is to terminate in this final manifestation of God, which is not so much a new revelation as a completion or application of that which has already been made in Christ. We can in looking at the Old Testament history partly see how things were preparing for Christ's coming, and yet men could not have gathered—as indeed in point of fact not even the best instructed persons did gather—either the time or the mode of His coming. So now we may dimly discern that things are working on towards His return to reign in glory, and yet

it is impossible to say when or how this shall be. But the first expectation having been fulfilled, it becomes the best guarantee that the second also will not be disappointed.

Besides, all this that we read in the Bible is so much in keeping, in its own way, with what science tells us, that our belief is aided and made easy. Science tells us that for hundreds of thousands of years this earth has been passing through tremendous changes—changes to which this cleaving of the Mount of Olives is like the scattering of a molehill by a passer's foot—and has been slowly, very slowly we should say, assuming the shape, the temperature, the atmosphere, the inhabitants it now has. It tells us also that though there have been great convulsions, breaking again and again the old order of things, bringing perpetual ice where there had been tropical vegetation, and extinguishing species of animals that have never again appeared, yet that through all there is distinctly apparent a connected thread which links the last appearances to the first. Now all this confirms, in three important respects, what these prophets tell us.

First.—Science and prophecy agree in calling our attention to the fact that God works on the principle of beginning at the beginning, of commencing with the seed small as a grain of mustard seed, but which is destined to fill the world's gaze as a tree; God begins with what is smallest and lowest and works on to what is highest and best. We should have said God must *begin* by giving to men the fullest knowledge of Himself. Science says, No; or if He does so, He acts in contradiction to all His other works, and to that mode of operation which meets us everywhere, and seems to be His law.

Second.—Science shows us that though things are only gradually and therefore very slowly evolved, yet there are great breaks and new points of departure every here and there. That is to say, the history of this earth, continued

through all these countless ages, has not been regularly continuous like the growth of a tree or of our own body, but it has resembled rather the growth of a nation, which is interrupted every now and again by a revolution, which is found to be helpful to its growth and to set it at once on a quite different level from that on which it has hitherto been. Or these breaks in the history of the earth may be compared to the breaks in the life of an individual, such, for example, as marriage, in which a man at one step enters upon quite a new stage and style of life, and not by any merely natural growth but by the action of his own will advances into new relationships. Similarly the Bible lays open to us a history which, while in the main it is a gradual evolution or growth, is broken in upon at one or two points by new forces, which compel it to a new course, or lift it at once to a new level or suddenly introduce elements which are to characterize the new period.

And third.—Not only do science and the Bible agree in showing us that the histories with which they are severally concerned are in both cases a slow growth from small and distant beginnings, interrupted every now and again by what seem to be new forces and interferences from without, but they also agree in affirming that there is one plan, or at all events one system, running through the whole, linking together the remotest past with the present, and proving that everything is connected with everything else, and can somehow be traced back to one common origin.

The prophet, foreseeing that all nations would give in their adhesion to the one true God, Jehovah, speaks of this under the forms with which he and his people were familiar. From all nations men would go up year by year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of Tabernacles. It is nothing to him that this is practically impossible. It is nothing to him that long religious pilgrimages are attended with disadvantages greatly outweighing

any advantages to be derived from them. It is nothing to him that the unity of religion which is secured by all men acknowledging one local centre is a greatly inferior unity to that which is secured by one spirit pervading all from centre to circumference. All this is nothing to the prophet whose business it is to convey to the men he has to do with a vivid impression of a great idea or event. The men to whom he was sent could not conceive of any religious unity which did not involve the recognition of one local, visible centre, as little as Mohammedans or Papists can. The idea of a universal religion could be conveyed to their minds only by some such representation as this, that all kinds of foreigners would be seen coming up year by year to Jerusalem to celebrate the great Jewish feasts. When he affirmed that all nations would one day come up and keep the feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem, he himself and those he spoke to understood that their God was to be universally acknowledged, and to object that the prophecy has not been fulfilled in the letter is very much the same as if you were to object to a person paying you in sovereigns a sum of money he had spoken of as so many dollars.

But why specify the feast of Tabernacles? The feast of Tabernacles was the commemoration of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness, and their dependence on God when they dwelt in tents, not tilling the ground in fixed places of abode. And it was accordingly celebrated annually when the harvest had been finished, and it was looked upon in the light of a national thanksgiving or acknowledgment that still they were dependent on the same God who had kept them alive without harvests. It is the acknowledgment, therefore, of the God of nature appearing and manifesting Himself as the God of grace and salvation; it was the feast by which all who engaged in it acknowledged the identity of the God who delivered His people from Egypt with the God who upholds all nature's laws. Most suitably,

therefore, is this the feast in which the nations join ; coming from distant lands, where nature appears in different aspects, they join in acknowledgment that Israel's God is that one in whom they live and move and have their being.

This acknowledgment, however, would not be without exception, not absolutely universal. On those who refused this acknowledgment, judgment would fall—judgment congenial with the offence—a withholding of rain which is the essential of harvest ; and in a country like Egypt, where no rain falls, or none to speak of, other punishment would occur. This suiting of punishment to the offence is a marked characteristic of God's government ; a principle which has been constantly remarked upon. Dante has largely utilized and illustrated it in his great poem. In his visit to the realms of punishment he saw tyrants immersed in a sea of blood ; gluttons exposed with all their pampered softness to a sleety tempest of cold, discoloured, stinking hail ; the proud bending for ever under heavy burdens which will not suffer them to stand erect ; schismatics who have rent the Church in two, themselves cleft asunder ; those who had pried into the future and professed prophetic powers had now their own faces reversed, so that they could not look before them and see their own way. A great part of the pain of punishment, and a great part of its remedial action, arise from this feature of it. Our punishment becomes insufferable not from its mere pain, but from the circumstance that the pain continually reminds us of the iniquitous and gratuitous and self-willed folly that has made this pain our lot in life. Were it not self-inflicted, we could bear it ; were it pain incurred in a good cause, we could glory in it ; but as it is, we can but hang our heads in shame and bear our misery alone and in secret as best we may. The only solace is that this misery may be remedial ; that this very pointed reference it bears to our sin may be helpful in separating us from the sin that caused it.

It does not always or necessarily do so. To the impotent man whom our Lord healed after thirty-eight years of punishment, He said, "Sin no more lest a worse thing come unto thee," seeing that after this lifelong punishment the power of sin was not broken. And how often have we seen the same ; a man all through life keeping himself back and gathering all kinds of misery around himself by persisting in sin, so that again and again we say, How is it possible he can persist in sin, no better, no wiser, for all he has come through ; but so it is, no amount of mere punishment changes the heart.

There is the same rational and significant connexion still existing between the sins and the punishments of communities. But if this connexion is often overlooked, ignored, or violently thrust out of sight by individuals, communities seem much more commonly to disregard its significance. The conscience of the community is scattered and lacks concentration. Yet in some matters it has been aroused, and the community has tardily shaken off a burden or cleansed itself from a blot. Revolutions and riots slowly led us to see that injustice was being done to large classes of the people. Cholera and typhoid fever slowly do their part in compelling attention to God's laws. And now in prolonged commercial depression we seem to be having another lesson read to us if only there are men of skill and courage enough to read it for us and lead the way in enforcing it. When catastrophes of a disastrous kind occur some law has been broken, and if we are to be free from their repetition these laws must be discovered, and must be observed. We are called to face a period of distress such as need not have occurred. Thousands are thrown out of employment and must be provided for, because some social law has been broken. No doubt accidents happen, disasters occur, in which no one is much to blame ; but until inquiry is made, no one has a right to assume that the accident was

unavoidable. We should feel that the authorities were not doing their part if no inquiry was made into each railway accident as it occurs; and the fact that other disasters are of greater magnitude and of longer duration and of more obscure origin ought not to lead us to class them as unavoidable calamities. As certainly as the dearth and drought in the countries spoken of by Zechariah, were meant to call attention to God and His laws, so certainly is the present distress meant to draw attention to what has been culpably neglected. The present distress will pass away, but it will be a thousand pities if it does so before it has compelled those whose duty it is, thoroughly to understand the real causes of it, and to take steps to prevent its recurrence. The contrivances for keeping the balance between different interests in society are of the rudest description; and if through the present distress some advance is made in adjusting class to class and making society more like a coherent unity, even those who suffer most will surely acknowledge that their suffering has not been in vain, but that they have been indirectly and perhaps unintentionally working out the welfare of future generations.

But that which is especially remarkable in this description of the consummation of all things is the abolition of the distinction between things sacred and secular. Men who have keenly felt the degradation and misery of our present entanglement in moral evil, have seen two ways out—but neither of these does the Jewish prophet welcome.

1st.—He does not promise us an emancipation from all connexion with things material, as if such an emancipation would of itself deliver us from evil into a state we could permanently live in with comfort. Some of the religions which have most powerfully appealed to earnest men have acquired their influence mainly by promising emancipation from sin by emancipation from all connexion with the

body and the material world. It is the flesh, they say, that leads us astray. Crucify the flesh, bring your body under, separate yourself from the world, do with as little food as possible, do not attend to the cleansing of the body or any of its wants, do not comfort it in any way, and you will be free from sin. In which there is a great deal more truth than we commonly admit, but when accepted as containing the whole truth, and as being in itself a perfect way of salvation, it is of course delusive. In this Jewish prophet there is none of the wholesale condemnation of matter you find in many other teachers. He, too, sees a way out of this present evil world; but it is not by emancipation from the body, nor by separation from the world, nor by ceasing to have to do with such demoralizing creatures as horses; but by bringing a holy spirit into all occupations, by writing on the bells that dangled from the horse-collars the inscription on the High-priest's frontlet, which had given him entrance to the Holiest of All.

This, then, is to be a characteristic feature of our eternal condition, that we are no longer to feel as if some moral contagion attached to the material world and to all worldly occupations; as if we had to admire the scenery of this earth by stealth, or to retain a scruple and hesitation about devoting time and energy to trade, or as if God turned away in displeasure or looked in pity and contempt when we enjoy any natural and innocent pleasure. Something of the ascetic feeling clings to us still, and few of us have the same clearness of perception about the holiness of things secular as Zechariah had. Nothing is itself sinful or profane which God has made; nothing common or unclean; but everything God has created is good and to be received with thanksgiving. Look at the life of our Lord, how He found all things sacred—birds, plants, dinings-out, paying His taxes, fishing, adventures on the lake, all occasions and all relationships of life. In His life the distinction between

sacred and secular is no longer possible. His glory was manifested at a marriage supper no less than in the synagogue or the temple.

But some lives fall quite manifestly into two parts, which, for all that appears, have little affinity to one another. Their sacred duties stand by themselves, and their secular duties are perfectly distinct. Some persons, indeed, seem to have no idea that religion is anything else than the devout performance of certain observances and the keeping-up of certain appearances. If you deprived them of the power of going to church, or of using certain phrases and forms of worship; if you took out of their day one or two half-hours in it, you would really leave them no religion at all; so easily separable is their religion from their life. Now so long as religion is a separate thing like this, it lies as a burden on a man, like undigested food in the stomach, only giving him uneasiness and dulling his vision and weakening him. It is a weight and a nuisance as long as it is a foreign body, a thing separate from the man's most real self. It is only when it is thoroughly absorbed and enters into the blood that it is a source of comfort and of strength, and becomes an unnoticed factor in all he does. Religion is a thing which need not have a separate place; it is to be the health-giving element in the atmosphere of the world, and must be found everywhere. It is a thing we can carry with us into all we do, for it is a matter of the heart and of the spirit; it is unison in will with God. Therefore in the perfected kingdom of God which Zechariah had in view, he saw no outward change effected. There were still horses with all their trappings; there were the sounds of trade and friendly intercourse in the streets; but the spirit was different. That kingdom does not require that men be grouped in relationships different from those which now connect us, or be engaged in occupations now unknown; it requires only that men live with God in all things.

2nd.—But Zechariah is, on the other hand, no secularist, who thinks that merely by forgetting God and going on with our worldly occupations we satisfy all requirements. The distinction between sacred and secular is to be abolished, not by making everything secular, but by making everything sacred; not by making the bowls which held the victims' blood like the pots in which the priests boiled their dinners, but by making these pots, which were no part of the sacred furniture, as sacred as the bowls which were essential to the worship. "Holiness to the Lord" is not to be obliterated from the High Priest's frontlet, so that the officiating priest might feel as little solemnized when putting on his mitre and entering the Holiest of All, as if he were going into his stable to put the collar on his horse; but when he puts the collar on his horse and goes out to his day's work, or his day's recreation, he is to be as truly and lovingly at one with God as when with sacrifice and incense and priestly garments he goes into the Holy of Holies.

This state, then, can never be attained by merely abolishing or neglecting sacred times and ordinances and observances. This is merely to ape a manhood we have not attained, and so to secure that we shall never attain it. In the state anticipated by the prophet we shall not need the ordinances we now need, or the Sabbaths that now recall us to the thought of things eternal; but he who forthwith abolishes his Sabbath because in a perfect state he would not need it, might as well leap confidently into deep water far from shore because, were he a perfectly accomplished man, he ought to be able to swim. We *ought* to be all the week in the state of spirit which the Sabbath rest and services induce, but *until* we are so in point of fact we cannot do without the Sabbath. And the consequence of assuming a superiority to such spiritual aid as the Sabbath brings would inevitably result in our bringing that day down to the worldly week-day level, and not in bringing the

week up to its level. The student hopes one day to be able to do without grammar and dictionary, but he knows he will arrive at that desirable state only in proportion as he now makes diligent use of grammar and dictionary.

Let us then so use the means of grace that we can rationally expect that one day we shall not any longer need them. When the diligent student has at length become a man of education and culture, all he does he does as a man of culture; that is the atmosphere he lives in, and you cannot run a distinction through his life and say, "These things he does in the spirit of an educated man and these others not." Education is wrought into the grain of his mind, and is part and parcel of the character—part and parcel of the man. But all this he has from his former recognition of his ignorance, of the broad distinction between ignorance and knowledge, and his resolution to bridge that interval. The present is the time given to us to bridge the interval between the secular and the sacred; to bring up all our employments to the level of "holiness to the Lord." Let us fix in our minds that this earth and its fulness belong to God; that He is with us in all our occupations. Let us make it our persistent, daily renewed aim to live for Him, to give ourselves to Him body and soul; and that which threatens to cut us off from all that attracts and makes life interesting will practically be found to be the gateway to more abundant, intense, and vital life.

MARCUS DODS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXIII.

PRECEPTS FOR THE INNERMOST AND OUTERMOST LIFE.

“Continue stedfastly in prayer, watching therein with thanksgiving ; withal praying for us also, that God may open unto us a door for the word, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds ; that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak. Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time. Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer each one.”—COL. iv. 2-6 (Rev. Vers.).

So ends the ethical portion of the Epistle. A glance over the series of practical exhortations, from the beginning of the preceding chapter onwards, will show that, in general terms we may say they deal successively with a Christian's duties to himself, the Church, and the family. And now, these last advices touch the two extremes of life, the first of them having reference to the hidden life of prayer, and the second and third to the outward, busy life of the market-place and the street. That bringing together of the extremes seems to be the link of connexion here. The Christian life is first regarded as gathered into itself—coiled as it were on its centre, like some strong spring. Then, it is regarded in its operation in the outer world, the wheels and pinions which the uncoiling spring will drive. These two sides of experience and duty are often hard to blend harmoniously. The conflict between busy Martha who serves and quiet Mary who only sits and gazes, goes on in every age and in every heart. Here we may find, in some measure, the principle of reconciliation between their antagonistic claims. Here is, at all events, the protest against allowing either to oust the other. Continual prayer is to blend with unwearièd action. We are so to walk the dusty ways of life as to be ever in the secret place of the Most High. “Continue stedfastly in prayer,” and withal let there be no unwholesome withdrawal from the duties

and relationships of the outer world, but let the prayer pass into, first, a wise walk, and second, an ever-gracious speech.

I. So we have here, first, an exhortation to a hidden life of constant prayer.

The word rendered "continue" in the Authorized Version, and more fully in the Revised Version by "continue steadfastly," is frequently found in reference to prayer, as well as in other connexions. A mere enumeration of some of these instances may help to illustrate its full meaning. "*We will give ourselves to prayer,*" said the Apostles in proposing the creation of the office of deacon. "*Continuing instant in prayer*" says Paul to the Roman Church. "*They continuing daily with one accord in the Temple*" is the description of the early believers after Pentecost. Simon Magus is said to have "continued with Philip," where there is evidently the idea of close adherence as well as of uninterrupted companionship. These examples seem to show that the word implies both earnestness and continuity, so that this injunction not only covers the ground of Paul's other exhortation, "Pray without ceasing," but includes fervour also.

The Christian life, then, ought to be one of unbroken prayer.

What manner of prayer can that be which is to be continuous through a life that must needs be full of toil on outward things? How can such a precept be obeyed? Surely there is no need for paring down its comprehensiveness, and saying that it merely means—a very frequent recurrence to devout exercises, as often as the pressure of daily duties will permit. That is not the direction in which the harmonising of such a precept with the obvious necessities of our position is to be sought. We must seek it in a more inward and spiritual notion of prayer. We must separate between the form and the substance, the treasure and the earthen vessel which carries it. What is

prayer? Not the utterance of words—they are but the vehicle; but the attitude of the spirit. Communion, aspiration, and submission, these three are the elements of prayer—and these three may be diffused through a life. It is possible, though difficult. There may be unbroken communion, a constant consciousness of God's presence, and of our contact with Him, thrilling through our souls and freshening them, like some breath of spring reaching the toilers in choky factories and busy streets; or even if the communion do not run like an absolutely unbroken line of light through our lives, the points may be so near together as all but to touch. In such communion words are needless. When spirits draw closest together there is no need for speech. Silently the heart may be kept fragrant with God's felt presence, and sunny with the light of His face. There are towns nestling beneath the Alps, every narrow, filthy alley of which looks to the great, solemn snow-peaks, and the inhabitants, amid all the squalor of their surroundings, have that apocalypse of wonder ever before them, if they would only lift their eyes. So we, if we will, may live with the majesties and beauties of the great white throne and of Him that sate on it closing every vista and filling the end of every common-place passage in our lives.

In like manner, there may be a continual, unspoken and unbroken presence of the second element of prayer, which is aspiration, or desire after God. All circumstances, whether of duty, of sorrow or of joy, should and may be used to stamp more deeply on my consciousness the sense of my weakness and need; and every moment, with its experience of God's swift and punctual grace, and all my communion with Him which unveils to me His beauty—should combine to move in my heart longings for Him, for more of Him. The very deepest cry of the heart which understands its own yearnings, is for the living God; and perpetual as the hunger of the spirit for the food which

will stay its profound desires, will be the prayer, though it may often be voiceless, of the soul which knows where alone that food is.

Continual too may be our submission to His will, which is an essential of all prayer. Many people's notion is that to pray is to urge our wishes on God, and that to answer our prayers is to give us what we desire. But true prayer is the meeting in harmony of God's will and man's, and its deepest expression is not, *Do this, because I desire it, O Lord*; but, *I do this because Thou desirest it, O Lord*. That submission may be the very spring of all life, and whatsoever work is done in such spirit, however "secular" and however small it be, were it making buttons, is truly prayer.

So there should run all through our lives the music of that continual prayer, heard beneath all our varying occupations like some prolonged deep bass note, that bears up and gives dignity to the lighter melody that rises and falls and changes above it, like the spray on the crest of a great wave. Our lives will then be noble and grave, and woven into a harmonious unity, when they are based upon continual communion with, continual desire after, and continual submission to, God. If they are not, they will be worth nothing and will come to nothing.

But such continuity of prayer is not to be attained without effort; therefore Paul goes on to say, "*Watching therein.*" We are apt to do drowsily whatever we do constantly. Men fall asleep at any continuous work—and then, besides that, there is the constant influence of externals, drawing our thoughts away from their true home in God, so that if we are to keep up continuous devotion, we shall have to rouse ourselves often when in the very act of dropping off to sleep. "*Awake up, my glory!*" we shall often have to say to our souls. Do we not all know that subtly approaching languor? and have we not often caught our-

selves in the very act of falling asleep at our prayers? We must make distinct and resolute efforts to rouse ourselves—we must concentrate our attention and apply the needed stimulants, and bring the interest and activity of our whole nature to bear on this work of continual prayer, else it will become drowsy mumbling as of a man but half awake. The world has strong opiates for the soul, and we must stedfastly resist their influence, if we are to “continue in prayer.”

One way of so watching is to have and to observe definite times of spoken prayer. We hear much now-a-days about the small value of times and forms of prayer, and how, as I have been saying, true prayer is independent of these, and needs no words. All that, of course, is true; but when the practical conclusion is drawn that therefore we can do without the outward form, a grave mistake, full of mischief, is committed. I do not, for my part, believe in a devotion diffused through a life and never concentrated and coming to the surface in visible outward acts or audible words; and, as far as I have seen, the men whose religion is spread all through their lives most really are the men who keep the central reservoir full, if I may so say, by regular and frequent hours and words of prayer. The Christ, whose whole life was devotion and communion with the Father, had His nights on the mountains, and rising up a great while before day, He watched unto prayer. We must do the like.

One more word has still to be said. This continual prayer is to be “with thanksgiving”—again the injunction so frequent in this letter, in such various connexions. Every prayer should be blended with gratitude, without the perfume of which, the incense of devotion lacks one element of fragrance. The sense of need, or the consciousness of sin, may evoke “strong crying and tears,” but the completest prayer rises confident from a grateful

heart, which weaves memory into hope, and asks much because it has received much. A true recognition of the loving-kindness of the past has much to do with making our communion sweet, our desires believing, our submission cheerful. Thankfulness is the feather that wings the arrow of prayer—the height from which our souls rise most easily to the sky.

And now the Apostle's tone softens from exhortation to entreaty, and with very sweet and touching humility he begs a supplemental corner in their prayers. "Withal praying also for us." And the "withal" and "also" have a tone of lowliness in them, while the "us," including as it does Timothy, who is associated with him in the superscription of the letter, and possibly others also, increases the impression of modesty. The subject of their prayers is to be that "God may open unto us a door for the word," a phrase which apparently means an unhindered opportunity of preaching the gospel, for the consequence of the door's being opened is added, "to speak (so that I may speak) the mystery of Christ." And the special reason for this prayer is, "for which I am also (in addition to my other sufferings) in bonds."

He was a prisoner. He cared little about that or about the fetters on his wrists, so far as his own comfort was concerned; but his spirit chafed at the restraint laid upon him in spreading the good news of Christ, though he had been able to do much in his prison, both among the Prætorian guard, and throughout the whole population of Rome. Therefore he would engage his friends to ask God to open the prison doors, as He had done for Peter, not that Paul might come out, but that the gospel might. The personal was swallowed up; all that he cared for was to do his work.

But he wants their prayers for more than that—"that I may make it manifest as I ought to speak"—this is probably explained most naturally as meaning his endow-

ment with power to set forth the message in a manner adequate to its greatness. When he thought of what it was that he, unworthy, had to preach, its majesty and wonderfulness brought a kind of awe over his spirit; and, endowed, as he was, with Apostolic functions and Apostolic grace; conscious, as he was, of being anointed and inspired by God, he yet felt that the richness of the treasure made the earthen vessel seem terribly unworthy to bear it. His utterances seemed to himself poor and unmelodious beside the majestic harmonies of the gospel. He could not soften his voice to breathe tenderly enough a message of such love, nor give it strength enough to peal forth a message of such tremendous import and world-wide destination.

If Paul felt his conception of the greatness of the gospel dwarfing into nothing *his* words when he tried to preach it, what must every other true minister of Christ feel? and if he, in the fulness of his inspiration, besought a place in his brethren's prayers, how much more must they need it, who try with stammering tongues to preach the truth that made his fiery words seem ice? Every such man must turn to those who love him and listen to his poor presentment of the riches of Christ, with Paul's entreaty. His friends cannot do a kinder thing to him than to bear him on their hearts in their prayers to God.

II. We have here next, a couple of precepts, which spring at a bound from the inmost secret of the Christian life to its circumference, and refer to the outward life in regard to the non-Christian world, enjoining in view of it, a wise walk and gracious speech.

"Walk in wisdom towards them that are without." Those that are within are those who have "fled for refuge" to Christ, and are within the fold, the fortress, the ark. Men who sit safe within while the storm howls, may simply think of the poor wretches exposed to its fierceness with selfish complacency. The phrase may express

spiritual pride and even contempt. All close corporations tend to generate dislike and scorn of outsiders, and the Church has had its own share of such feeling; but there is no trace of anything of the sort here. Rather is there pathos and pity in the word, and a recognition that their sad condition gives them a claim on Christian men, who are bound to go out to their help and bring them in. Precisely because they are "without" do those within owe them a wise walk, that "if any will not hear the word, they may without the word be won." The thought is in some measure parallel to our Lord's words, of which perhaps it is a reminiscence. "Behold I send you forth"—a strange thing for a careful shepherd to do—"as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents." Think of that picture—the handful of cowering frightened creatures huddled against each other, and ringed round by that yelping, white-toothed crowd, ready to tear them to pieces! So are Christ's followers in the world. Of course, things have changed in many respects since those days. Partly that persecution has gone out of fashion, and partly that "the world" has been largely influenced by Christian morality, and partly that the Church has been largely secularized. The temperature of the two has become nearly equalized over a large tract of professing Christendom. So a tolerably good understanding, and a brisk trade has sprung up between the sheep and the wolves. But for all that, there is fundamental discord, however changed may be its exhibition, and if we are true to our Master and insist on shaping our lives by His rules, we shall find out that there is.

We need, therefore, to "walk in wisdom" towards the non-Christian world; that is, to let practical prudence shape all our conduct. If we are Christians, we have to live under the eyes of vigilant and not altogether friendly observers, who derive satisfaction and harm from any incon-

sistency of ours. A plainly Christian life that needs no commentary to exhibit its harmony with Christ's commandments is the first duty we owe to them.

And the wisdom which is to mould our lives in view of these outsiders will "discern both time and judgment," will try to take the measure of men and act accordingly. Common sense and practical sagacity are important accompaniments of Christian zeal. What a singularly complex character, in this respect, was Paul's—enthusiastic and yet capable of such diplomatic adaptation; and withal never dropping to cunning, nor sacrificing truth! Enthusiasts who despise worldly wisdom, and therefore often dash themselves against stone walls, are not rare; cool calculators who abhor all generous glow of feeling and have ever a pailful of cold water for any project which shows it, are only too common—but fire and ice together, like a volcano with glaciers streaming down its cone, are rare. Fervour married to tact, common sense which keeps close to earth and enthusiasm which flames heaven high, are a rare combination. It is not often that the same voice can say, "I count not my life dear to myself," and "I became all things to all men."

A dangerous principle that last, a very slippery piece of ground to get upon!—say people, and quite truly. It is dangerous, and one thing only will keep a man's feet when trying it, and that is, that his wise adaptation shall be perfectly unselfish, and that he shall ever keep clear before him the great object to be gained, which is nothing personal, but "that I might by all means save some." If that is held in view, we shall be saved from the temptation of hiding or maiming the very truth which we desire should be received, and our wise adaptation of ourselves and of our message to the needs and weaknesses and peculiarities of those "who are without," will not degenerate into handling the word of God deceitfully. Paul advised

“walking in wisdom,” he abhorred “walking in craftiness.”

We owe them that are without such a walk as may tend to bring them in. Our life is to a large extent their Bible. They know a great deal more about Christianity, as they see it in us, than as it is revealed in Christ, or recorded in Scripture—and if, as seen in us, it does not strike them as very attractive, small wonder if they still prefer to remain where they are. Let us take care lest instead of being doorkeepers to the house of the Lord, to beckon passers-by and draw them in, we block the doorway, and keep them from seeing the wonders within.

The Apostle adds a special way in which this wisdom shows itself—namely, “redeeming the time.” The last word here does not denote time in general, but a definite season, or *opportunity*. The lesson, then, is not that of making the best use of all the moments as they fly, precious as that lesson is, but that of discerning and eagerly using appropriate opportunities for Christian service. The figure is simple enough; to “buy up” means to make one’s own. “Make much of time, let not advantage slip,” is an advice in exactly the same spirit. Two things are included in it; the watchful study of characters, so as to know the right times to bring influences to bear on them, and an earnest diligence in utilizing these for the highest purposes. We have not acted wisely towards those who are without unless we have used every opportunity to draw them in.

But besides a wise walk, there is to be “*gracious speech*.” “Let your speech be always with grace.” A similar juxtaposition of “wisdom” and “grace” occurred in chapter iii. 16. “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom . . . singing with grace in your hearts”; and there as here, “grace” may be taken either in its lower æsthetic sense, or in its higher spiritual. It may mean either favour, agreeableness, or the Divine gift, be-

stowed by the indwelling Spirit. The former is supposed by many good expositors to be the meaning here. But is it a Christian's duty to make his speech always agreeable? Sometimes it is his plain duty to make it very disagreeable indeed. If our speech is to be true, and wholesome, it must sometimes rasp and go against the grain. Its pleasantness depends on the inclinations of the hearers rather than on the will of the honest speaker. If he is to "redeem the time" and "walk wisely to them that are without," his speech cannot be always with such grace. The advice to make our words always pleasing may be a very good maxim for worldly success, but it smacks of Chesterfield's Letters rather than of Paul's Epistles.

We must go much deeper for the true import of this exhortation. It is substantially this—whether you can speak smooth things or no, and whether your talk is always directly religious or no,—and it need not and cannot always be that—let there ever be in it the manifest influence of God's Spirit, who dwells in the Christian heart, and will mould and sanctify your speech. Of you, as of your Master, let it be true "Grace is poured into thy lips." He in whose spirit the Divine Spirit abides will be truly "Golden-mouthed"; his speech shall distil as the dew, and whether his grave and lofty words please frivolous and prurient ears or no, they will be beautiful in the truest sense, and show the Divine life pulsing through them, as some transparent skin shows the throbbing of the blue veins. Men who feed their souls on great authors catch their style, as some of our great living orators, who are eager students of English poetry. So if we converse much with God, listening to His voice in our hearts, our speech will have in it a tone that will echo that deep music. Our accent will betray our country. And then our speech will be with grace in the lower sense of pleasing. The truest gracefulness, both of words and conduct comes from

grace. The beauty caught from God, the fountain of all things lovely, is the highest.

The speech is to be "*seasoned with salt*." That does not mean the "Attic salt" of wit. There is nothing more wearisome than the talk of men who are always trying to be piquant and brilliant. Such speech is like a "pillar of salt"—it sparkles, but is cold, and has points that wound, and it tastes bitter. That is not what Paul recommends. Salt was used in sacrifice—let the sacrificial salt be applied to all our words; that is, let all we say be offered up to God, "a sacrifice of praise to God continually." Salt preserves. Put into your speech what will keep it from rotting, or, as the parallel passage in Ephesians has it, "let no *corrupt* communication proceed out of your mouth." Frivolous talk, dreary gossip, ill-natured talk, idle talk, to say nothing of foul and wicked words, will be silenced when your speech is seasoned with salt.

The following words make it probable that salt here is used also with some allusion to its power of giving savour to food. Do not deal in insipid generalities, but suit your words to your hearers, "that ye may know how ye ought to answer each one." Speech that fits close to the characteristics and wants of the people to whom it is spoken is sure to be interesting, and that which does not will for them be insipid. Commonplaces that hit full against the hearer will be no commonplaces to him, and the most brilliant words that do not meet his mind or needs will to him be tasteless "as the white of an egg."

Individual peculiarities, then, must determine the wise way of approach to each man, and there will be wide variety in the methods. Paul's language to the wild hill tribes of Lycaonia was not the same as to the cultivated, curious crowd on Mars' Hill, and his sermons in the synagogues have a different tone from his reasonings of judgment to come before Felix.

All that is too plain to need illustration. But one word may be added. The Apostle here regards it as the task of every Christian man to speak for Christ. Further, he recommends dealing with individuals rather than with masses, as being within the scope of each Christian, and as being much more efficacious. Salt has to be rubbed in, if it is to do any good. It is better for most of us to fish with the rod than with the net, to angle for single souls, rather than to try and enclose a multitude at once. Preaching to a congregation has its own place and value; but private and personal talk, honestly and wisely done, will effect more than the most eloquent preaching. Better to drill in the seeds, dropping them one by one into the little pit made for their reception, than to sow them broadcast.

And what shall we say of Christian men and women, who can talk animatedly and interestingly of anything but of their Saviour and His kingdom? Timidity, misplaced reverence, a dread of seeming to be self-righteous, a regard for conventional proprieties, and the national reserve account for much of the lamentable fact that there are so many such. But all these barriers would be floated away like straws, if a great stream of Christian feeling were pouring from the heart. What fills the heart will overflow by the floodgates of speech. So that the real reason for the unbroken silence in which many Christian people conceal their faith is mainly the small quantity of it which there is to conceal.

A solemn ideal is set before us in these parting injunctions—a higher righteousness than was thundered from Sinai. When we think of our hurried, formal devotion, our prayers forced from us sometimes by the pressure of calamity, and so often suspended when the weight is lifted; of the occasional glimpses that we get of God—as sailors may catch sight of a guiding star for a

moment through driving fog, and of the long tracts of life which would be precisely the same, as far as our thoughts are concerned, if there were no God at all, or He had nothing to do with us—what an awful command that seems, “Continue stedfastly in prayer”!

When we think of our selfish disregard of the woes and dangers of the poor wanderers without, exposed to the storm, while we think ourselves safe in the fold, and of how little we have meditated on and still less discharged our obligations to them, and of how we have let precious opportunities slip through our slack hands, we may well bow rebuked before the exhortation, “Walk in wisdom toward them that are without.”

When we think of the stream of words ever flowing from our lips, and how few grains of gold that stream has brought down amid all its sand, and how seldom Christ’s name has been spoken by us to hearts that heed Him and know Him not, the exhortation, “Let your speech be always with grace,” becomes an indictment as truly as a command.

There is but one place for us, the foot of the cross, that there we may obtain forgiveness for all the faulty past, and thence may draw consecration and strength for the future, to keep that lofty law of Christian morality, which is high and hard if we think only of its precepts, but becomes light and easy when we open our hearts to receive the power for obedience, “which,” as this great Epistle manifoldly teaches, “is Christ in you, the hope of glory.”

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

BREVIA.

Note on Isaiah xli. 18.—How are we to understand the phrase מוֹצָאֵי מַיִם occurring in this verse? The Revised Version follows the Authorized in rendering by “springs of water.” The last edition of Canon Cheyne’s commentary on Isaiah gives the same equivalent. Professor Delitzsch interprets the passage:—“The desert becomes a lake and the heath of burning sand the sources of streams,” and as his translation he gives “Wasser sprudeln.”

I merely suggest for consideration whether מוֹצָאֵי מַיִם should not be taken in the sense of “water-course” or “water-channel” instead of “spring” (מַיִם עֵין Gen. xxiv. 13, 43, עֵין or מַצְעָן). The root צִא meaning “go forth” generally refers to the starting point of the movement, but it may be employed without special reference to the *terminus a quo* as in Ps. civ. 23. Indeed it may designate the end of the movement as in Exod. xxiii. 16, בִּצְאֹת הַשָּׁנָה “at the end of the year.” Similarly מוֹצָאֵי means properly “forth- or out-going” and may refer not only to the starting point but also to the end, as in the Mishna-phrase מוֹצָאֵי יוֹם טוֹב “evening of a festival.” That מוֹצָאֵי may denote also the material object or instrument (“out-let” or “channel”), like other nouns with preformative מ (Stade, §§ 268–9), seems confirmed by the plural form מוֹצְאוֹת the Kri (euphemistic?) substitute for מוֹרְאוֹת in 2 Kings x. 27. In Aramaic מוֹצֵי signifies properly “to sprout” and the actual equivalent of Heb. מוֹצֵי is נֶצֶק

Now, when we turn to the earliest version of the O. T. we find there a reminiscence of the old and true signification, as I venture to surmise, of מוֹצָאֵי מַיִם. In Isa. xli. 18. the LXX. render מוֹצָאֵי מַיִם by ὑδραγωγόι, “water-channels.” In the parallel passage contained in the later appendix to Psalm cvii. (evidently based on the utterance of the Deutero-Isaiah) מוֹצָאֵי מַיִם is translated by διέξοδοι, while in 2 Kings ii. 21, the same Greek equivalent is used. It is also the term employed to render the פְּלִי מַיִם of Ps. i. 3. I have certainly no disposition to overrate the critical value of the LXX., but its testimony ought never to be lightly passed over, and I would venture to suggest the possibility that we have here a clue to a lost meaning. In the Aramaic versions, belonging unquestionably to a much later period, we have a later tradition. These con-

sistently render by מִפְקֵנֹת דְּמִיָּא or מִפְקֵנֹת (Syriac . . . ⁷ ⁶ ⁵ ⁴ ³ ² ¹ ⁰ or ⁷ ⁶ ⁵ ⁴ ³ ² ¹ ⁰). On the other hand, the Vulgate oscillates between the two traditions, rendering now by *fontes*, now by *rivi aquarum*. Comp. LXX. in Isa. lviii. 11.

But indications of a more positive character are forthcoming. In the inscription of Nebucadnezzar, describing the restoration of the temple of Borsippa, and the dilapidated condition in which he found it, there occurs the phrase col. i. 32 *la šutīšuru mûši mû-ša*, "There was no regulation of its water-gutters" (or "water-drainage") where *mûši mî* is the Assyrio-Babylonian equivalent of מוֹצֵא מַיִם, as Prof. Schrader has already pointed out (*Univ. Insc. and the O. T.*, vol. i. p. 111). Again, in the Siloam-inscription occurs the phrase וילכו המים מן המוצא אל הברכה, "and the waters flowed from the channel into the pool [along a distance of 1200 cubits]." I admit that the rendering "spring" adopted by Prof. Sayce furnishes a perfectly intelligible meaning. But the translation above given harmonizes better with 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. "Likewise it was Hezekiah who stopped up the upper water-channel of the Gihôn (מוֹצֵא מַיִם יְהוֹן הַעֲלִיִּן) and guided the waters straight downwards to the west of the city of David." Here the translation of the Revised Version, "upper spring," appears hardly to make sense. Indeed Prof. Sayce himself gives in this passage the rendering "upper water-course" (*Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, p. 103), since, as he says, there was only *one* natural source, the Virgin's Spring, near to Jerusalem. The upper conduit seems to have led to the upper pool (בְּרִכָּה), mentioned by Isaiah, the lower conduit to the lower pool, both being supplied from the same source, viz., the Virgin's Spring (comp. Isa. xxii. 9, 11, with 2 Kings xx. 20; Isa. vii. 3, where תַּעֲלָה appears to be used as the equivalent of מוֹצֵא). Lastly, in this connexion, I would draw attention to the circumstance that מוֹצֵא is used in Job xxviii. 1 for the mine (or channel?) whence silver ore is extracted.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

INDEX.

Right Rev. W. Alexander, D.D.

PAGE

Some Gleanings from St. Peter's Harvest-Field.

St. Peter's Epistles:—

- I. Preface.—Theology of the Inscription 1
- II. St. Peter in Sacred History compared with his
own Self-Delineation in his Epistles 183
- III. A Christian Woman and a Wicked Woman: A
Contrast 266

Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

- On the Book of Judith 79
- On Job vi. 25 79
- On Ps. cxxiii. 2 80

The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald:—

- I. The Development Period 241
- II. His Weakness and his Strength, as a Critic and as
a Man 361

Rev. Professor S. Ives Curtiss, D.D., Ph.D.

Recent American Literature on the Old Testament 392

Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.

The Revised Version of the Old Testament:—

- The Book of Job.—I. 274
- The Book of Job.—II. 424

Rev. Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D.

Dancing and Pentateuch Criticism in Correlation 81

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

Recent English Literature on the New Testament 68

The Book of Zechariah:—

- IV. The Flying Roll and the Ephah 136
- V. Religious Observances 216
- VI. The Shepherd of Israel 306
- VII. National Revival 335
- VIII. The Consummation 253

E.

Recent Assyrian and Egyptian Literature 228

Rev. Professor John Forbes, D.D., LL.D.

Galatians iii. 20. 150

Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D.

The First Indications of Gnosticism in Asia Minor :—

The Epistle to the Colossians 161

Rev. Henry Hayman, D.D.

The Westcott-Hort " Genealogical " Method 411

H. S. Keating.

On Hebrews ix. 16, 17. 240

Rev. John Ker, D.D.

A Complete Life 377

Rev. Professor A. F. Kirkpatrick, M.A.

The Revised Version of the Old Testament :—

The First Book of Kings 60

The Second Book of Kings 107

The First Book of the Chronicles 112

The Second Book of the Chronicles 115

The Book of Ezra 117

The Book of Nehemiah 118

Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

The Epistle to the Colossians :—

XVIII. Slaying Self, the Foundation Precept of
Practical Christianity 44

XIX. The New Nature brought out in New Life 95

XX. The Garments of the Renewed Soul 204

XXI. The Practical Effects of the Peace of Christ, the
Word of Christ, and the Name of Christ 293

XXII. The Christian Family 346

XXIII. Precepts for the Innermost and Outermost Life 465

Rev. Principal Rainy, D.D.

Joseph's Forgetting 401

Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D.

Bishop Lightfoot 13

Dr. S. M. Schiller-Sziessy.

St. Paul from a Jewish Point of View 321

George Augustus Simcox, M.A.

Secret History of St. Paul 156

Rev. W. H. Simcox, M.A.

On St. Luke ix. 18 159

On Rev. i. 14 316

Rev. Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D.

PAGE

The Prophecies of St. Paul :—

I. 1 and 2 Thessalonians 30

II. The Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and

Romans 131

III. The Later Epistles 349

Hon. Lady Welby-Gregory.

Thoughts 148

Dr. C. Wessely.On the Spread of Jewish-Christian Religious Ideas among
the Egyptians 194**Rev. Professor Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A.**

On Isaiah xli. 18 479

The Editor.

The late Rev. Dr. John Ker 398

Notes and News 318, 400

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xxiii. 4	7	2 Chronicles	115
xli. 51	401	Ezra	117
Exodus xiii. 21	198	Nehemiah	118
Leviticus xxiii. 10	83	Job	274
xxiii. 27	87	vi. 25	79
xxiii. 34	89	vii. 20	284
Joshua iii. 15	198	ix. 13	286
Judges xxi.	89	ix. 21	287
1 Kings	60	xi. 7	290
i. 18, 20	61	xiii. 15	291
iv. 19	62	xvii. 3	426
iv. 24	62	xvii. 6	427
ix. 8	64	xix. 17	429
ix. 13	65	xix. 25, 27	430
ix. 18	65	xxi. 19.	433
x. 5	65	xxiii. 16, 17	436
xiii. 12	66	xxxi. 35	438
2 Kings	107	Psalms xxxix. 12	7
viii. 10	108	lxviii. 24, 25	93
xi. 4	109	cii. 24	377
1 Chronicles	112	civ. 33	273

	PAGE		PAGE
Psalms cxviii. 27	86	1 Corinthians xv. 20-28	139
cxix. 151	415	xv. 35-50	136
cxliii. 2	80	2 Corinthians	131
Proverbs xxi. 10.	268	Galatians	131
Isaiah ix. 3	92	i. 17	156
xxvii. 13	332	iii. 20	150
xii. 18	479	iv. 1-3	167
lxi. 5, 6	324	Philippians i. 6, 10	442
Daniel xi. 36	40	iii. 20, 21.	442
Zechariah v.	119	iv. 18	332
vii., viii.	216	Colossians	161
xi.	306	ii. 16	165, 168
xii., xiii.	335	iii. 5-9	44
xiv.	453	iii. 9-11	95
Malachi iii. 1	183	iii. 12-14	204
Matthew xvi. 18, 19.	1	iii. 15-17	293
xxiii. 15	323	iii. 18 }	346
xxiv. 15	40	iv. 1 }	346
xxiv. 23	38	iv. 2-6	465
Mark iv. 21-24	149	1 Thessalonians	30
xv. 17	200	ii. 16	42
Luke vii. 32	83	iv. 13-18	31
ix. 18	159	v. 1	450
x. 17.	200	2 Thessalonians	30
xxii. 31, 32	3	i. 6-10	33
John i. 43	188	ii. 3-12	39
vii. 37-39	91	1 Timothy vi. 14, 15	450
xxi. 7	5	2 Timothy ii. 18	448
xxi. 17	185	iv. 8	447
xxi. 18, 19	5	Titus ii. 13	447
Acts i. 15-23	2	Hebrews ix. 16, 17	240
ii. 2	199	James i. 17	149
ii. 14-36	2	1 Peter i. 1, 2	1
iii. 1	3	ii. 4-9	188
iii. 19.	187	ii. 23 }	191
v. 3-10	2	Luke xxiii. 46 }	191
vii. 53	166	1 Peter iii. 1-7	267
xv. 11	3	iii. 4	266
xvii. 24-31.	31	iv. 19 }	191
xxii. 28	321	Luke xxiii. 46 }	191
xxiii. 6	325	1 Peter v. 1	184
xxiv. 15	444	v. 5 }	187
xxvi. 29	163	John xiii. 4-8 }	6, 186
Romans	131	1 Peter v. 12	4
viii. 18-25	146	v. 13	6
1 Corinthians	131	2 Peter i. 14	266
iv. 5	133	ii. 14	68
v. 1-10	146	Revelation	316
xiii. 1-8	334	i. 14	

